India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1898.

No. 20. New Series.]
No. 114. Old Series.]

[Registered as a Newspaper.] Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News	305	Chronicle of the Week	314
"The Government of India"... ...	308	Mr. A. M. Bose's Campaign: Text of Resolutions Adopted...	315
The Evil of "Over-Centralisation"	309	Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., on the Position in India	315
A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Colonel H. B. Hanna	310	The Committee on Currency	317
"Social Evolution"	311	India in Parliament	317
Mark Twain's Impressions of India	312	Advertisements	319-320
The Week in Parliament	313		

NOTES AND NEWS.

MR. GLADSTONE is dead. His death has not, indeed, come upon the civilised world by surprise, but the shock of loss—almost a personal loss it must seem to many thousands—is no less poignant because it has been anticipated for many anxious days. It is impossible to attempt here any estimate of the beneficent and therefore glorious career of the statesman whose chief praise it has always been to bring to the transaction of public affairs the great unwasted force of noble character and unflinching courage. But we are very sure that in the profound and universal sorrow which his death has caused, the people of India will sincerely share. In no other part of the world, indeed, have so many millions of British subjects to mourn the loss of one whose name is to them a synonym for justice, wisdom, and high resolve.

On May 8 the following letter was sent to Mr. Herbert Gladstone by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, on behalf of the London Indian Society:—

Washington House, 72, Anerley Park, London, S.E.
May 8, 1898.

Dear Mr. Herbert Gladstone,

On behalf of the London Indian Society I have to request you to communicate to your father, the Grand Old Man of the British Empire, our deep sorrow at his serious illness, and our sincere and earnest wishes that his sufferings may be alleviated. We might cite various instances of Mr. Gladstone's consideration and sense of justice to India and its people. At present we content ourselves with citing the following passage from his speech on Mr. Fawcett's motion urging that the cost of the Afghan War of 1878-80 should not be wholly cast on the revenues of India. This instance, in sight of the treatment of similar recent claims, is of much significance. These are Mr. Gladstone's noble words (Hansard, vol. 251, p. 930), March 12, 1880:—

"It appears to me that, to make such a statement as that the judgment of the Viceroy is a sufficient expression of that of the people of India, is an expression of paradox really surprising, and such as is rarely heard among us. . . . . (p. 932.) In my opinion my hon. friend the member for Hackney has made good his case. . . . . His case, as I understand it, has not received one shred of answer (p. 933). In the speech of the Prime Minister, the speech of Lord Salisbury, and the speech of the Viceroy of India, and, I think my hon. friend said, in a speech by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, this Afghan war has been distinctively recognised as partaking of the character of an Imperial war. . . . . But I think not merely a small sum like that, but what my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer would call a solid and substantial sum, ought to be borne by this country, at the very least. : . . . (p. 935). As regards the substance of the motion, I cordially embrace the doctrine of my hon. friend the member for Hackney. There is not a constituency in the country before which I would not be prepared to stand, if it were the poorest and most distressed in the land, if it were composed of a body of men to all of whom every addition of a farthing for taxes was a sensible burden, and before them I would be glad to stand and plead that, when we have made in India a war which our own Government have described as in part an Imperial war, we ought not for a moment to shrink from the responsibility of assuming, at least, a portion of the cost of that war, in correspondence with that declaration, instead of making use of the law and argument of force which is the only law and the only argument which we possess or apply to place the whole of this burden on the shoulders of the people of India."

These declarations made a profound impression on the Indian people, followed up as they were by Mr. Gladstone's Ministry by a grant of £5,000,000 towards the cost of that war. This act of Mr. Gladstone is cherished by the people of India as an illustration of the principles of justice and equity which are characteristic of the British people.

We also desire that you will kindly express to Mrs. Gladstone, and other members of the family, our sincere sympathy in their present great anxieties.—I remain, yours truly, Dadabhai Naoroji.
President.

Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.,
Hawarden.

The following telegram was sent on May 16 by the Naba Bharat Sabha (New India Association):—

To the Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone,
Hawarden Castle, Chester.

The members of the Naba Bharat Sabha (New India Association), composed of Hindu and Mahometan students residing in this country, beg to offer their sincerest sympathy at this hour of your sad trial and suffering. You have ever been the champion of Freedom and Liberty. God bless you.—A. K. Ghose. (*Hon. Sec.*)

On Friday last we received a telegram from our Bombay Correspondent as follows:—

The detention of the Natus has been only partially relaxed. They are released on parole and may not leave Belgaum, and their property still continues to be attached. There is much dissatisfaction here at the hesitation of the authorities to confess that the deportation of the Natus was a great blunder committed in a time of panic.

On the following day we received this further telegram:—

Orders have now been issued releasing the property of the Natus.

These telegrams were at once communicated to the British Press. It will be remembered that in the House of Commons yesterday week, Lord G. Hamilton made a statement substantially identical with the earlier portion of our correspondent's first telegram.

As will be seen from our Parliamentary report, Lord G. Hamilton stated on Tuesday, in reply to Mr. Herbert Roberts, that he had decided "to leave" the new laws of sedition "to their operation." Lord G. Hamilton appears to have forgotten that in the debate on February 18 (see "Will Parliament Abdicate?" India, p. 196) he undertook that when the "opinions" expressed in the Legislative Council came home, "if it was desired that they should be published, he would at once do so, and that would form a legitimate and proper opportunity for discussing the matter." What is the meaning of "at once"?

When repressive measures are needless and unjust they are apt to fail, as the Government of India has had many opportunities of learning. A recent instance is the case of the Sivaji Festival at Poona. It seems to have been a harmless festival, but the unwise efforts of the Government to stamp it out have given it almost a political importance. The *Mahratta* says:—

The authorities, it may be easily believed, must have regarded the prosecution of the *Kesari*, and the conviction of its editor, as having hermetically sealed the fate of the Shri Shivaji movement in India. It is natural that they should have thought their grand *coup-d'ètat* of last year to be of such striking force as must for ever paralyse the activity of the advocates of the Shivaji Festival. The facts, however, prove that the authorities had rather exaggerated notions of their own power as they had certainly mistaken notions about the real character of the Shivaji movement. They will therefore receive a rude shaking when they come to know that the Shivaji Festival is not given up by the Poona people as was expected by them.

We are glad to learn that the festival has passed off without any unpleasant incidents.

The following is quoted by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* from the Anglo-Indian *Morning Post*:

An unfortunate accident occurred at Messrs. Cooper, Allen and Company's Cawnpore establishment a few days ago, which was attended by fatal results. Mr. Tresham, one of the staff, kicked a Native employee, and the latter died very shortly after. Mr. Tresham was fined Rs. 200 yesterday by the Joint-Magistrate. This is the second case of the kind that has happened at Cooper Allen's.

These "unfortunate accidents" are somewhat frequent. Is a fine a suitable penalty in such cases?

An extraordinary story comes from the Satara District. Mr. Rowecroft, a military officer in charge of a plague circuit, not satisfied with the salute of Mr. Sohoni, an elderly man, assistant master of the Satara High School, is said to have slapped his cheeks, and told him, "You must know how to salute a man of the ruling race." The *Mahratta* says:—

The arrogance of individual Europeans has begun to assume an

alarming aspect, and we appeal to Government to take earnest steps to check it, for neglect in the matter would give rise to the thought that Government approves even of such arrogant conduct on the part of its officers. It is, therefore, not so much in the interest of the helpless Native subjects as the powerful European rulers themselves that we raise our voice of warning and point out that Government should lose no time in taking stringent steps to check the arrogance of the European community in India. It is this spirit of pride and contempt of the rights of the Natives that makes the estrangement of the rulers and the ruled wider every day. It is this spirit which, more than anything else, produces a sort of disaffection in the hearts of the people, and if there be any danger to British rule in India it may arise only from this mischievous spirit of Europeans. Whatever else may be said of the Indian people, it must be admitted that their susceptibilities are keen; and the effect of continual shocks dealt to it without relief from Government would better be imagined than described.

Presumably, Mr. Rowecroft's superior officers are looking into the matter.

In spite of such cases as this, it is doubtful whether any people is more responsive to sympathy than the Indian. Two good instances are referred to in the *Champion*:—

Who does not remember the case of Colonel Medows Taylor, who' when returning to India after many years of absence, was met by hundreds of the country people of the province he had formerly ruled over, and it is stated in the story of his life that numbers of these people had travelled on foot a distance of 155 miles in order to pay their respects to him, and assure him that "our women sing of you as they grind corn in the morning, and light their lamps in your name at night"—and these people were Hindus! Another instance, and we have done. A young lady, the daughter of a respected missionary in Bombay, lately died, and in a little memoir of her life written by her mother, in describing the last scene of the young life so prematurely taken, occurs this passage: "It was very touching to see the sorrow of the sepoys, mill-hands, servants, and beggars near our home in Bombay,"—when they learnt of her death. "*It was not that she had given them money* (the italics are ours)—it was because she had given them love and sympathy."

The *Indian Spectator*, one of the most moderate of Indian journals, makes the following remarks upon a recent incident at Poona:—

The outrage committed by the two soldiers of the Durham Light Infantry at Poona last week is one of those lamentable instances which have come to notice in pretty swift succession of late. A tailor sitting in his shop was wantonly injured in the arm by the discharge of a shot from an air-gun. Driving off from that place, a sweeper and a woman were as wantonly shot at and injured. Of course, no one can reasonably expect either the Government or the military authorities to be able to prevent such incidents altogether, since they not rarely happen through drunkenness and the excitement caused by wild propensities on the part of the British soldier. But both Government and those directly responsible to the public for the good conduct of these men can do something towards making such cases of mischief as rare as could be.

We have nothing to add to this, except that we suppose "those directly responsible to the public for the good conduct of these men" take due note of such occurrences.

The evil, however, seems to be growing. Even the *Pioneer* regrets it:—

A few days ago (it says) we noticed the Secretary of State's answer to a query in the House of Commons regarding a similar case on the Bombay side: "Passes," said Lord George Hamilton, "to go out shooting are only given out to men of good character and under very stringent regulations." In both the Poona case and the Fatehpur case, however, the men broke out of barracks without shooting passes at all, and instances like this are becoming so frequent as to suggest a doubt whether the punishment awarded by the military authorities is sufficiently deterrent. There can be no question that these shikarring misadventures have caused much irritation of late years, and every possible precaution ought to be taken to reduce the chance of their occurrence. The punishment for shooting without a pass ought to be made more and more drastic until it becomes virtually deterrent. In the present instance also it appears that the accused went out shooting with a Lee-Metford. Shooting peafowl with a Lee-Metford rifle is a curiosity in sport, the peculiar humour of which is no doubt fully appreciated by Thomas Atkins, but it is also a very dangerous amusement, and the soldier who indulges in it should be punished with additional severity.

Sir Theodore Hope has attempted to defend the payment by the State of the Anglican clergy in India, by arguing that, as Mahometans and Hindus possess ancient endowments, it is only fair that the English Church should be endowed out of the public revenue. This does not seem very obvious, but let it be granted. Let us admit for the moment that the Anglican Christian in India is entitled to a provision for his spiritual needs equivalent to that obtained by the non-Christian Indian from ancient endowments. Then if we take, in round numbers, the non-Christian population of India at 200 millions, the Anglicans at 200,000, and the Mahometan and Hindu endowments at 350 lakhs, we have the following sum: 200 millions are to 350 lakhs as 200,000 are to Rs. 35,000. So that by Sir Theodore's own argument, the English Church is entitled, not to Rs. 22,00,000 which it now gets, but only to Rs. 35,000. The Anglicans might well ask to be saved from their friends. But, of course, the argument itself is fallacious. As the *Friend of India* pertinently asks:

Is it in the Thirty-nine Articles that in every country where any religious body possesses property, the members of the Anglican Church may rightly charge the salaries of their Bishops to the Exchequer?

It may or may not be worth noting that at a dinner given a few days ago in connexion with the Urban District Council for Seaham Harbour—a town "created" by the Londonderry family—the chairman, Mr. J. J. Candlish, J.P., the leading Liberal of the locality, proposing the health of the Marquis and Marchioness of Londonderry, said he was delighted to hear that it was not at all unlikely that Lord Londonderry would be appointed Viceroy of India.

The Hon. P. M. Mehta has consented to be nominated to the seat in the Viceroy's Council vacated by the Hon. Mr. Sayani. A better selection could not, we think, have been made. There is no public man in India who has served the interests of his countrymen with greater zeal and utility than Mr. Mehta. We congratulate him upon his re-election.

The first meeting of the Bengal Legislative Council at which the new Lieutenant-Governor presided was held on April 16. The Budget was discussed, and the Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjea raised the question of the wider employment of Indians in higher appointments in the minor Civil Services. With regard to the Forest Service, the Lieutenant-Governor replied: "If hon. gentlemen who belong to this country can induce the natives of Bengal to enter classes for the study of forestry, I shall give them the most hearty encouragement myself." Sir John Woodburn's reply and his attitude generally towards the members of the Council appear to have given satisfaction.

Lord G. Hamilton's "body of practical men assembled for a practical purpose" are not to pursue their secret investigations undisturbed, as the following statement of the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (May 17) shows:—

The Indian Currency Committee is exciting great interest in high financial circles in the City. Lord George Hamilton's appointments to the Committee are severely criticised. The terms of reference are regarded as not affording scope for a sufficiently full enquiry into the policy of the Indian Government initiated in 1893 and the effects of the closed mints upon the finances and commerce of India. The proposals of the Indian Government for a gold standard are also condemned, and especially the clause which provides for raising large sterling loans in this country and shipping sovereigns to India. These points have been set forth in a protest to be presented to the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary for India, which has already been signed by a number of the large joint-stock and private banks, by most of the directors of England, and by other authorities on finance, as well as by leading firms in the Indian trade. As showing how profoundly the City is stirred on the subject, it may be mentioned that some of the banks and financial houses who have signed the protest are noted for never signing anything relating to public affairs, but they have made an exception to the rule in this instance.

Statements to the same effect have also appeared in the *Daily News* and the *Westminster Gazette*.

When the monetary question is stirring again, and people generally find its principles incomprehensible, it may be worth while to recall Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's pamphlet on "Indian Exchanges and Bimetallism" (London: Foulger and Co., 13, Paternoster Row, E.C.) This pamphlet is a reprint of a number of letters addressed to the *Times* and the *Daily News* in 1886, when the currency question was ablaze. The importance of it lies in its simple and perspicuous treatment of the subjects. Mr. Dadabhai takes an export transaction, and limits his attention to the effect of the exchange alone, assuming other circumstances to remain the same. The process seems obvious enough, and yet the correspondence evoked shows how hard a saying it is to people that will not think the matter out definitely. Let us reproduce his example:

I take an illustration in its simplest form. Suppose I lay out Rs. 10,000, to export 100 bales of cotton to England. I then calculate, taking exchange into consideration, what price in England will enable me to get back my Rs. 10,000 together with a fair profit—say 10 per cent.—making altogether Rs. 11,000. Suppose I take exchange

at 2s. per rupee, and find that 6d. per lb. will bring back to me in remittance as much silver as would make up Rs. 11,000, I then instruct my agent in England to sell with a limit of 6d. per lb., and to remit the proceeds in silver, this being the simplest form of the transaction. The result of the transaction, if it turned out as intended, will be that the cotton sold at 6d. per lb. will bring back to me Rs. 11,000, and the transaction will be completed.

Now, I take a transaction when exchange is 1s. 4d. instead of 2s. per rupee. I lay out Rs. 10,000 for 100 bales of cotton; all other circumstances remaining the same, I calculate that I can get back my Rs. 10,000 and 10 per cent. profit, or Rs. 11,000 altogether, if my cotton were sold at 4d. per lb. Then I instruct my agent for a limit of 4d., which being obtained, and silver being remitted to me at the reduced price, I get back my Rs. 11,000.

The common impression seems to be that "just as I received 6d. per pound when exchange was 2s. per rupee, I get 6d. also when exchange is only 1s. 4d. per rupee, and that silver being so much lower, I actually get Rs. 16,500, instead of only Rs. 11,000." This is a complete misapprehension, of course. "When exchange is 2s. I get 6d. *of gold*; when exchange is 1s. 4d., I do not get 6d. of gold, but 4d. of gold, making my return *of silver*, at the lower price, *of the same amount in either case*—viz., Rs. 11,000." The italics are ours.

Mr. Dadabhai illustrates, with like simplicity and clearness, the converse case of imports. His conclusion necessarily is, that "all other circumstances remaining the same, the indentor from India pays more or less gold according to the state of the exchange, paying less gold when gold is high or exchange and silver low, or paying more gold when gold is low and exchange or silver high; *the result being that the importer pays the same amount of silver whether exchange is low or high.*" (Our italics.) The general result is this:—

To sum up. For the bulk of the trade, other circumstances remaining the same, India does not get for her exports more silver for her produce, but less gold at lower exchange; and she does not pay for her imports more silver, but less gold at lower exchange. In actual operation, the result, of course, is not so rigid: various influences affect the course of the market. What I mean is this, that taking the simple element of appreciation of gold and fall in silver or exchange, the course of trade is not much affected in prices in India. Were India concerned merely in the fall in exchange and nothing else, that would not have mattered much to her, beyond making the owners of gold so much richer in proportion to the fall in silver as compared with gold, and introducing an additional element of the chances of profit or loss in the fluctuations in the rate of exchange during the pendency of the transactions. But even in that case, the exporting merchant protects himself from this risk by selling his bills against his produce to the Indian banks, whereby the rate of exchange for his transaction is fixed.

The real cause of suffering to India is a very different one; the political situation, as explained last week—and every week. It is the administration of a deplorably poor country by foreigners, on principles that would strain the resources even of a fairly rich country. This pamphlet of Mr. Dadabhai's ought to be widely circulated when the questions it handles are again under urgent reconsideration.

Mr. W. R. Lawson, writing in the *Bankers' Magazine*, exhibits a breezy contempt for "the accumulated wisdom of all the economic authorities," and holds that there is no doubt that the officials responsible for India's currency experiment will "ultimately" succeed in "groping their way by such light as their own experience can supply to them" to the establishment of a working ratio between the rupee and the pound sterling. "But how they are to do it, and how long it may take them," he admits, "we can form no opinion as yet." He says:

The most essential factor in the process is the cordial support of the Imperial Government, which seems, at last, to be forthcoming. Compared with that, the amount of gold likely to be needed to guarantee the new standard, the contraction of the silver currency, and the form of convertibility to be adopted, are all, in our opinion, secondary questions. When the two Governments—Imperial and Indian—jointly pledge themselves to do whatever may be necessary to give the rupee an exchange value of *16d. on an average of the commercial year* (Mr. Lawson's italics), the main point will be achieved.

If the main point were the bolstering up of the monetary position by artificial agencies, that is so. But even then the "secondary questions" come in, and assert themselves with such urgency that "the most essential factor" is at once found to be absolutely dependent upon their due solution. "India," says Mr. Lawson, "is not necessarily bound to realise all our European ideas of a gold currency." What then?

The whole duty of her Government is to provide the people with an efficient medium of exchange. Gold enough for that purpose and no more will be indispensable. The Government is not bound to go further and act the part of metal brokers to all and sundry. It need not let itself be forced into the untenable position of having to find gold and silver for all comers. There are many uses of gold and silver outside of currency altogether. They may be wanted for hoarding, or for speculation, or for political objects. On the other hand, a Government like that of India cannot safely undertake to let gold and silver be dumped on it to an indefinite extent.

It will be interesting to see how the reserved "right of discrimination" will operate in India. Mr. Lawson even has the courage to suggest the imperialisation of the rupee. "Assimilate the rupee to our florin, and the half-rupee to our shilling, and let them circulate side by side all over the empire. That would be a cheap as well as an effective safeguard against redundancy."

Mr. Lawson thus seems to show that he does not know the merest elements of currency—he does not know the essential difference between a rupee and a florin or a shilling. A shilling is not essentially a silver coin but a token of a gold coin, namely $\frac{1}{20}$th of a sovereign. A shilling does not contain as much silver as is worth a shilling, *i.e.*, $\frac{1}{20}$th of a sovereign. A penny, similarly, is not essentially a copper or bronze coin, but a token of a gold coin, namely, $\frac{1}{240}$th of a sovereign. A penny does not contain as much copper or bronze as is worth $\frac{1}{240}$th of a sovereign, nor is a shilling legal payment to any amount. A creditor is not bound to receive more than a certain number of shillings in shillings, or florins, or any of the silver coins which are simply tokens or portions of the sovereign. A rupee, on the other hand, is quite a different thing. It is what it professes to be, just as the sovereign is what it professes to be. A sovereign is a certain fixed quantity of gold, stamped with the legal stamp, and it is nothing else. It is the standard by which other commodities are priced. So, too, a rupee is a certain fixed quantity of silver, stamped with the legal stamp. It is the standard for the measure of the price of other commodities, and the Government is entitled to ask for only such a rupee from the taxpayers. The true rupee is at present worth, say, 11d. or 12d. of gold. The artificial "rupee" now exacted from the Indian taxpayer by the Government is not the true or legal rupee, but one nearly 45 per cent. higher in value than the true rupee, or 16d. worth of gold. In this way the burden of taxation is covertly increased by 45 per cent. for the Indian taxpayer. When Mr. Lawson has learnt this first lesson in currency, it will be time to consider what he has further to say.

Mr. Donald N. Reid writes: "The following extracts from a letter of mine which appeared in the *Pioneer*, in August, 1892, may be of interest at the present moment:—

The memorial of the Darjeeling and Terai Planters' Association to the Viceroy on the Currency Question is the first sensible paper that I have seen on the subject, with the exception of a letter from Mr. Macpherson, of Agrail Factory, Firkert. . . . Last year, with the rupee at 1s. 5d., my indigo sold at only Rs. 180 per maund, a most disappointing result. But if the rupee drops to one shilling, as I hope it will, I should get close on Rs. 300 per maund for indigo this year, and make a small profit, notwithstanding the indifferent season.

Well, exchange fell to 1s. 2⅞d. in 1892, and my indigo of that year sold for Rs. 321 per maund, or Rs. 141 per maund in advance of the price realised for indigo of similar quality in the year 1891 when the rupee was at 1s. 5½d. These statements may be verified by reference to any indigo broker's price list."

"If the Plague Committee," says the *Champion* of Bombay, "is now to receive its extreme unction, none will regret it." The fate of the Bombay Plague Committee teaches more than one lesson. The Municipal Corporation of Bombay, representing the people, was quite competent to take precautionary measures against the plague, but the Government chose to entrust that duty to a foreign body, the Plague Committee. The result is now before us. The method of the Committee's work gave rise to complaints, and caused much vexation to the people, and the *Champion* asserts that the riot of March 9 last was the direct outcome of the Committee's unsympathetic action. Lakhs of the people's money have been spent with no apparent result, and at last the Government thought it wise to stop further mischief and to work through the representatives of the people. It is the old story over again: it is not possible to rule India except through the Indian people.

"THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA."[1]

THE statutory enactments constituting the basis of the authority of the Government of India extend over a period of more than a hundred and twenty years, and their chaotic condition has been troublesomely felt for a long time past. The same provisions have in some cases been enacted two, and even three, times over, with more or less modification, but without repeal of the earlier law; whether in sheer forgetfulness or ignorance, or with the doubtful purpose of making assurance doubly and triply sure. In any case, the result is to provide a series of complicated puzzles, which have to be resolved somehow before the business in question can be proceeded with. "A consolidating Act," says Sir Courtenay Ilbert, "would repeal and supersede more than forty separate statutes relating to India." Apart from this sort of mischievous muddle, there is difficulty in connexion with the older statutes in point of expression. Some of them "are expressed in language suitable to the time of Warren Hastings, but inapplicable to the India of to-day, and unintelligible except by those who are conversant with the needs and circumstances of the times in which they were passed." Really, there ought to be no difficulty on this score. Officials might not unreasonably be expected to know something of the history of the country during the English domination. Yet we have just had a remarkable illustration from Bombay in the recent refurbishment of the antiquated Regulation of 1827, which shows conclusively how little the Bombay officials at any rate understand the history of their law, or the meaning and purpose of their laws. It is somewhat humiliating, no doubt; but then there the fact is, and we have to put up with it.

It may seem surprising that the Government itself has not taken the matter in hand with firmness and energy. But this would defeat the great principle of not doing to-day what you can put off till to-morrow—the principle of cheerfully ignoring accumulations of grit in the works of the machine. Yet in 1873, the Secretary of State for India actually went so far as to send out to Calcutta the rough draft of a Bill to consolidate these enactments. Correspondence ensued. Eventually, in 1876, the Government of India submitted to the India Office an amended draft, embodying a number of suggested alterations in the law. The history of the effort is short and uneventful. "After that date" (February, 1876), says Sir Courtenay Ilbert, "the matter was allowed to drop." Just so. The surprising thing is, not that it was allowed to drop, but that it was ever taken up at all. However, it was left, in the result, to the private efforts of an interested student. It could not have fallen into better hands. Sir Courtenay Ilbert began his career with an exceptionally distinguished record at Oxford. He has had long experience of parliamentary draughtsmanship at Whitehall, and from 1882 to 1886 he acted as legal member of the Governor-General's Council. The "Ilbert Bill" is now an historical bone of contention. Sir Courtenay, then, being interested in the subject, took up the consolidating draft of 1873, and brought it down to date. His revised draft was submitted to the Secretary of State, who communicated thereon with the Government of India; and the sapient conclusion of these notable functionaries was "adverse to the introduction of a consolidating measure into Parliament at the present time." Of course, the less Parliament talks about the Government of India the better—for the temporary incumbents. The India Office, however, was equal to a suggestion: "The draft might, if published as a digest of the existing law, be useful both to those who are practically concerned in Indian administration, and to students of Indian administrative law."

Such, then, is the genesis of the nucleus of the present work. The author sets out in concise summary the existing system of administrative law in India. Then he lays hold of the existing Parliamentary enactments relating to the Government of India, and casts them into the form of a digest, framed on the lines of a consolidation bill to be submitted to Parliament. He draws out a scheme of the whole project; distributes the provisions of the enactments under their appropriate heads, not in the very words of the statutes necessarily, but in terms of his own, conveying his conception of the net effect of their significance; and adds explanatory notes and references. The process is sufficiently arduous. "When it is applied to a large number of enactments belonging to different dates"—dates more than a hundred years apart—"it is always found that there are *lacunae* to be filled, obscurities to be removed, inconsistencies to be harmonised, doubts to be resolved." A chance selection of a few of the paragraphs will very promptly impress on the understanding eye the complexity and magnitude of the difficulties that the digester has to tackle. It is like blazing your way through the jungle, only the process is much more bewildering. And after the digester has lavished unstinted labour on the task, his conclusions remain of no more authority than the statements of the ordinary law text-book writer, however much respect may be conciliated by the ability and special experience of the compiler. Still, it is a distinct step gained. It will facilitate the work of the next generation, and by-and-by there will come to the helm of affairs some steersman that will have the courage to do the right thing—set his boat's nose to the wind and the waves, and cease to tumble miscellaneously, ignominiously, and dangerously in the trough of the sea, a plaything of the elements. Complementary to this substantial section is a chapter on the rules made under statutory authority with respect to the constitution and procedure of the Indian Legislative Council. This is an extremely useful part of the work, showing at a glance the working of the main part of the machinery of government and administration. Another chapter contains the charters of the four High Courts. Such, in brief, is the character of the main part of the book. It is hardly necessary to add that the details have been elaborated with extreme care and with marked ability. The immense utility of the work is obvious; and it is exceedingly creditable to the public spirit of the author that he should have devoted the leisure hours of many years to the accomplishment of such a perplexing, tiresome, and—in a sense—thankless task.

But this is not all. Prefixed to the body of the work is an "Historical Introduction," which runs to more than a hundred pages. Considering the dense ignorance of Indian history that prevails even among officials, one cannot but admit the necessity of some such sketch in order to render the existing law intelligible. So far as this goes, the author claims no credit for independent research. He acknowledges, justly enough, that there are many excellent summaries of British Indian history, general and in periods; but at the same time it must be said for him, if he is too modest to say it for himself, that one cannot even turn the leaves of his introduction without being impressed with his statement that "a history of the rise and growth of the British Empire in India, on a scale commensurate with the importance of the subject, still remains to be written." Of course, Sir Courtenay shapes his historical sketch, less in view of a comprehensive history, and mainly in view of his own particular concern in the body of his work. But incidentally he shows on every page glints of what yet remains to do, notwithstanding all that has hitherto been done. Will he himself now buckle to the task? The adequate accomplishment of such a work would prove peculiarly valuable at the present time, when public interest in India is reviving in England, and needs so much to be fostered, instructed and confirmed.

Besides, there are two important chapters dealing with Native relations. One of these reviews the application of English law to the Indians. Sir Courtenay shows how the original principle of applying Native law to Natives eventually broke down, and how codification was the imperative result of practical requirements. Now, the criminal law, the law of civil and criminal procedure, and the law of contract and torts (with a few exceptions), are based wholly on English principles; and there is room for much doubt whether such principles have not been pushed rather far, and somewhat too hastily. There is great danger in outrunning the popular feeling, especially when the athletic and cocksure Englishman has the ordering of things without restraint from the reasonable representations of Native opinion. Within the domain of family law, however—including the greater part of the law of succession and inheritance—the personal law still rules, though to some extent modified or formulated by Anglo-Indian legislation; and the law relating to land tenure

[1] "The Government of India: being a Digest of the Statute Law relating thereto." With Historical Introduction and Illustrative Documents. By Sir Courtenay Ilbert, K.C.S.I. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

"exhibits a struggle and compromise between English and Indian principles." Sir Courtenay is not so enthusiastic for codification of the Native law as we recently found Sir Roland Wilson to be. The time, he thinks, is not yet; "there is reason to believe that Sir Roland has much underrated the difficulties of such a task." There is certainly a serious element of objection in the fact that "the difficulty begins when a particular code is presented in a concrete form." Sir Courtenay cites specific instances of such difficulty, which are not to be overlooked with impunity. The other chapter contains a most lucid and important exposition of the British jurisdiction in Native States, which "may vary both in nature and in extent between very wide limits." The remainder of the book—more than a fourth of the whole—is usefully occupied by a reprint of "illustrative documents," which are not always readily accessible, and will be found a great convenience to practical administrators as well as to students.

THE EVIL OF "OVER-CENTRALISATION."

IN the controversial writings and apologies of Anglo-Indians British rule in India appears as the very image of perfection, a beneficent union of intelligence and sympathy, a splendid example of probity and efficiency. They are never tired of telling us how thankful the Indians ought to be that the fates have bestowed on them such excellent rulers, or of expatiating on the black ingratitude which ventures to criticise so benign a system, or finds spots on the glorious sun of England's Empire. But when we leave the arena of general controversy, and come to questions of administration, treated, not with a view to refuting the claims of Indians or the criticisms of their English advocates, but from the standpoint of practical efficiency, we find that another spirit prevails. In place of perfection we hear of urgent need of reform, while the *Pioneer*, leaving for a moment the duty of blessing the English Government of India, proves itself a very Daniel come to judgment. In the last issue of INDIA attention was called to the *Pioneer's* remarks on the constant shifting of officials, on the want of the local knowledge which thence resulted, and on the loss of sympathy between Indians and English which these frequent transfers entailed. The *Pioneer* now returns to the charge with an equally vigorous attack on the growing over-centralisation of the present system—an attack which is not only interesting as an exposure of practical defects, but as containing incidentally much evidence of the dangerously artificial character of the present government of India. It is scarcely necessary to say that no one is opposed to a certain amount of centralisation: and the *Pioneer* is careful to distinguish between the centralisation which is a benefit and that which is an evil, shedding by the way a suggestive light on many points connected with the present system:

> A healthy centralisation we would describe as a general control over main principles, combined with a complete dissociation from minor details; and we regard that centralisation as unhealthy where the central authority, in eagerness or indifference, by drift or of set purpose, expatiates into the direction of details and endeavours in a word to codify the conduct of multiplex and ever-varying affairs. The strongest evidence of the unhealthiness of the present system—which is the subject of common complaint—will perhaps be found in the consummation and perfection of that system, in the voluminous expansive manuals of orders in every department of Government; so voluminous that the central authorities themselves are not infrequently compelled to disregard their own instructions, or to choose between their own conflicting orders.

In considering the causes of this growing evil there is first the increased interference from home:—

> A large, if not the leading responsibility for the observed result will be alleged by many against the continuous interference of English politicians in Indian affairs. And, indeed, it can scarcely be denied that the modern facilities for daily communication between England and India, and the growing interest taken at home in Indian affairs, promote conditions under which it is a great convenience to Indian Governments to hold the strings of administration tightly in their own hands. The constant calls for information or explanation, on the one hand, and the natural desire for fame and good repute at home on the other, must, in the nature of things, stimulate the Governors and men in high authority to display that statistical mastery of their charges, and that power, if we may say so, of administrative mobilisation, which only reach their full development in a highly centralised system.

But besides this, there are the frequent changes of local officials, the fact that the central staff is overmanned, while the local authorities have great difficulty in coping with their work, and the six months' residence of the former in the hills.

This last seems the most curious of all. The contrast of the officials on the hills braced up for work and eagerly turning their hands to whatever they can find to do, with the unfortunate commissioners, relaxed by the heat of the plains, and doing as little as possible, brings out forcibly the artificial character of the English Government, boasting of its rule over millions of Indians, while its own energy is sapped, and it loses the vigour by which alone that rule can be made a success. The English ruler of India has the fatal choice of being either a stranger in a strange land, or of losing that force of character which alone makes his position tenable. Such is the dilemma of Anglo-Indian government.

The evils of this system of centralisation are sufficiently obvious. As the *Pioneer* says:—

> Men working at a distance and under the stress of intellectual presumptions are inevitably out of touch with the requirements of the people. The local officers, too, are disheartened by their loss of initiative and power, by the continual criticism of their work and the curtailment of their responsibilities; and constructive zeal gives way to a critical mood regarding the action of their superiors, or else they overlook local needs in blind submission to a central generalisation. In any case local needs are sacrificed to central theories, and headlong reforms are precipitated at the cost of local interests. In this way Government becomes hard and unsympathetic, as every Government must be which is not sensitive to local feeling. And not the least regrettable result is the temptation thereby afforded to influential Native gentlemen to go direct with their requests to the central authorities. The latter being only human are apt, of course, to interpret the appeal as a flattering personal attention; but in acceding to it they inevitably drive a wedge between the local authorities and those who should be their close allies. The imperative necessity for friendly intercourse is constantly preached by superior authority; we wonder how often the preachers undermine their own doctrine by direct dealing and a total disregard of the local authorities. It is always galling to be ignored, particularly at the instance of a man within one's own jurisdiction.

It is, however, when we come to remedies that the weakness of the *Pioneer's* position becomes plain. Nothing, indeed, can be said against the proposal to deplete the overgrown staff of the central authority, and make those who would have become under-secretaries, assistants to the commissioners; and much may be said in favour of the substitution of quinquennial for annual reports. The position of a commissioner, thus assisted, would bulk more largely in the public mind, and officials of many years' standing would be saved the investigation of minor details which could be left to the younger men. But the *Pioneer* admits all this would not be enough; that there must be a new and wider spirit in the administration. Yet, as might be expected, one very obvious remedy for some of the evils that have given rise to over-centralisation is omitted. The employment of Indians in association with English officials is nowhere mentioned, and yet there are plain advantages. They will not require constant furlough; their energy will not be sapped by the climate of the plains; they, whatever be their faults, will not be ignorant of the land and the people. These are great and undeniable advantages which are independent of the capacity of the particular officials chosen. Even if it were granted, for the sake of the argument alone, that in the traditions of official probity, in practical efficiency, in strength of will, in breadth, in foresight the Englishman is superior to the Indian, it must of course still be admitted that in India the latter is more closely in touch with his environment, that much comes to him instinctively which the Englishman has to learn painfully and through many mistakes, and that sympathy in the rulers is an essential of good government. What, then, can be a more obvious mode of improving the government of India than admitting a greater number of Indians to a share in it? Between them, the English and the Indians possess the qualifications for successful administration. Is it not the natural way out of the difficulty to seek to associate them together—to unite Indian knowledge of the country with the qualities of Englishmen—and thus to pave the way for each to obtain some share of the good characteristics of the other? The government would be better administered, and the Indians would receive a real education in the art of ruling. It is not, however, quite certain that this would be a result pleasing to the *Pioneer*, and yet while this jealousy of the people of the country exists in their rulers, what chance is there of that growth of sympathy so anxiously desired? It is well said, in a passage already quoted, that influential Indians should be the close allies of the local authorities. Is there not a third reason why

this is difficult—a reason in addition to the centralisation and the transfers which the *Pioneer* has so usefully denounced? Are not the distrust shown by the government, the contempt of many Anglo-Indians, and the aim, the almost openly avowed aim of excluding the Indians from all real power in their own land, other obstacles in the way of that close alliance, which has never seemed more distant than now? The ignorance of the country, the lassitude and the frequent transfers of local officials are placed among the causes of over-centralisation. By all these Indians would be less affected. But, nevertheless, the association of Indian with English officials is not to be increased. That remedy must remain untried.

The *Pioneer* concludes its article with a sketch of an ideal central authority:

A man with large practical experience of affairs; with great powers of self-control; of wide sympathies not only with the officers of Government but with the people; whose chief desire is to guide and not to goad; who counts it a loss to give offence, and the highest gain by suggestions to persuade; but above all who knows, and himself has felt, that the success of any scheme depends upon the spirit in which it is executed, and who, therefore, when he sees that others have taken great pains and interest in any matter will be careful not to chill that interest or to convert a constructive into a critical attitude, by attempting to improve what is already good; and finally who appreciates to the full how courtesy and encouragement and a kindly human interest assist the disposal of public affairs. Such men are few, but they exercise a great influence, and when they go to the head it is very well for all.

A LESSON FROM THE TIRAH CAMPAIGN.[1]

By Colonel H. B. Hanna.

(Formerly belonging to the Punjab Frontier Force, and late Commanding at Delhi.)

"A modern army is such a very complicated organism, that any interruption in the line of communications tends to break up and destroy its very life."—Lord Wolseley.

"We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed upon Russia, if that Power seriously thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our own frontier, and met her halfway in a difficult country, and possibly in the midst of a hostile or exasperated population. We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move might require, and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure for measures which they can both understand and appreciate."—Lord Lawrence.

Whatever the immediate political value of the Tirah campaign may be—and I, for one, believe that, if it had never been undertaken, the Afridis would still have been submitting to-day, yielding to the deadly pressure of a strictly enforced blockade—its ultimate value to all the parties concerned in it—Great Britain, India, and the Tribes—will be great, and greatly beneficial, if it serves to dissipate the glamour which has gathered round the Trans-Caspian railway, and strips that line of its pretensions to be accepted as a chief factor in the problem of the future defence of India's North-West frontier, in virtue of its supposed power to relieve Russia's invading armies of the greater part of their transport difficulties.

There are two ways in which a railway can exercise a favourable influence on the great problem which has vexed the soul of every commander since war begun: it can quicken the movements of transport by conveying it to the point where its services will be required; or, leaving it to find its way thither by road, it can diminish its amount. In which of the two is it expected that the Trans-Caspian railway will be able to assist Russian forces advancing upon India, or are they to have the benefit of both?

Let us see what the Tirah campaign has to say as to the first.

Running through very difficult country, in which there is little water, less food, and very few inhabitants, the Trans-Caspian railway can never rival the North-Western of India in the excellence of its permanent way, the number of its stations and its sidings, and the amount of labour that can be brought to bear on any portion of it; and yet, last autumn, on a comparatively short stretch of the latter line, between Lahore and Peshawar, so great was the overcrowding, and so many the delays, that many mules and ponies, intended for use in the Tirah expedition, died in the trains from exposure and starvation; many more reached Peshawar unfit for service; and the troops had to wait so long for their transport as almost to miss the chance of moving at all.

Long before this expensive object-lesson was given for the benefit of those who needed its teachings, it was clear to men who took the trouble to work out the question in detail, that railways could not carry hundreds of thousands of animals, chiefly camels—the most difficult of all creatures to move by rail—on a journey of many hundred miles; for, even if their rolling-stock and engine-power were equal to the gigantic task, no human forethought, energy, and care could insure to so vast a multitude, day by day, the barest modicum of food and water; and, closely packed in open trucks, denied all possibility of rest, exposed alternately to intense heat and bitter cold, they must perish of sickness and fatigue, even if, in some inconceivable way, they escaped dying of thirst and hunger. To-day, every intelligent reader of newspapers who has asked himself whether the recent frontier war has any bearing on the question of the possibility, or impossibility of an invasion of India—is probably convinced that the colossal transport of a Russian army, destined to achieve the conquest of that country, would always have to move by road to the point where the troops would leave the line, and must reach that point in advance of them; for, if it were not awaiting their arrival, the whole enterprise would come to a disastrous standstill.

But here the forward school in Indian frontier politics is sure to quarrel with the epithet "colossal" as begging the question that is still in dispute, or, indeed, all the questions originally raised; for, so they will argue, it has still to be proved that the removal of the Russian rail-head to a spot many hundred miles nearer to India than that where it now stands, will not so diminish the amount of the Russian transport as to admit of its being moved, after all, by rail.

Once again let us turn to the Tirah campaign, and ask what light it can throw upon the claim thus put forward on behalf of some future terminus of a Russo-Afghan line, to so disturb the balance of probabilities in a contest between Russia and Great Britain on India's old frontier as to render imperative the occupation of a new one.

Sir William Lockhart's 25,000 men never got further than 50 miles from their rail-head; yet, though they marched in lightest order, and were not encumbered with heavy cannon and pontoons, 75,000 mules and ponies were not too many for their needs in an eight weeks' campaign. Now, Kabul is 170 miles from the Indian frontier, Kandahar 400 from the Indus; so that, if the Russians elect to invade India by the former city, and we assume them to number 150,000 and to take two months to get through the Khyber, they will require 450,000, or, if they prefer to tempt fate by the Bolan, 900,000 mules[1] to bring them within sight of their objective; and however great may be the difference between these numbers and those that would have been needed by the invaders had they begun their march at the Caspian—from the point of view of the safety of India, I think I am entitled to claim that it need not be taken into account.

But, apart from its incapacity to carry the transport of a large army, or to exercise any appreciable influence on its amount, the Trans-Caspian railway can never materially affect the problem of the defence of India; for when, at enormous expense, it has been extended to Kabul, it will be but single-lined; liable, at many points, to be buried under sand-drifts or snow, and at many others to be swept away by floods; everywhere exposed to attack from Persia and the tribes, requiring, therefore, to be guarded from end to end—a task which, in time of war, would absorb the services of many thousand troops;—a railway which must bring not only much of its water but all its fuel from the Caspian; on which it would be impossible to run a dozen trains in each direction *per diem;* to which if an army once entrusted its fortunes, there could be no alternative means of advance, and along whose entire course destruction must be the fate of forces depending on it for progress, reinforcement, and supply when the inevitable breakdown occurred—inevitable, because no railway, let alone one worked under such an

[1] This article is circulated by the National Reform Union as a leaflet.

[1] This latter figure is not arrived at by doubling, for the Bolan route the transport required for the Khyber, but by first deducting from the latter the animals required for the carriage of baggage, which may be regarded as the same whether the distance be long or short, and then multiplying the same 300,000 by two and a half, the difference in distance, and also in time, between the one march and the other; and to the 750,000 thus obtained re-adding the 150,000 previously subtracted.

accumulation of adverse circumstances, could bear the strain to which this line would be subjected when the great host which is to wrest India from the British crown is, at last, set in motion.

It may be said that Russia, who has taken two hundred years to get half way to India, may be trusted not to endanger her ultimate success by premature action; and that, continuing her slow forward movement, she will so consolidate her power at every stage of her journey, and so multiply her bases of supply, that, at the end, she will find herself with a large force ready to her hand, and will have nothing to do but to step across the frontier, defeat the Anglo-Indian army, and enter into the enjoyment of all its resources—railways, arsenals, food magazines, etc. —and so escape the transport difficulty altogether. No doubt, if she indulges in the dream of adding India to her empire, these must be her plans; but, unless she can convert Trans-Caspia and Afghanistan into fruitful lands, and—what would be almost as great a miracle—so win the attachment of their peoples as to be able to dispense with troops on her long line of communications (Skobeleff reckoned them at 90,000)—she will find it more difficult and costly to move large forces gradually up to the confines of India, than to hold the intermediate territory with the smallest garrison compatible with its own safety, and to do the whole work of marching, or railing, a big army from the Caspian to the Indus in one, or, at most, two seasons. Geographically, the Indian Government is in a far better position than Russia for extending its authority to Afghanistan; yet it has twice made the attempt and twice relinquished it; not because it could not march its troops to Kandahar and Kabul, but because it could not support them in those cities when it got them there; and though a completed Caspian railway would make it easier for Russia to convey stores of all kinds into Afghanistan, these, so far as they consisted of food and forage, would be consumed by the large garrison she would be compelled to maintain in that country almost as fast as they arrived.[1] And if it would be difficult to accumulate beforehand in Afghanistan any large quantities of grain and bhoosa, and to keep them in good condition for an indefinite number of years, it would be quite impossible to do this, and at the same time to feed in addition to its garrison a second and much larger force whilst waiting for a favourable opportunity of attacking India; so that, railway or no railway, the invaders, the invaders' transport, and a large proportion of the invaders' stores, would always have to be drawn at the last possible moment from beyond the Caspian.

But if these things are as I say—and I defy any man to show how they could be different—the conditions of the defence of India have not changed since the days of Lord Lawrence; and there never was, and never can be, any excuse for reversing that statesman's wise, humane, and economical policy.

"SOCIAL EVOLUTION."[2]

MR. KIDD'S work on social evolution has had a notable success. It has been reprinted many times in England, and several times in America, since its first appearance in 1894; it has been translated into German, Swedish, French, Russian, and Italian; and the author has taken the opportunity of the publication of the nineteenth thousand in England to add an appendix, which purports to be a reply to his many critics. When the appendix is examined, however, it discloses no argument—only a restatement of the main thesis of the book, and a triumphant declaration that this thesis has never been fairly faced or refuted, and that the critics have occupied themselves with details which are quite unessential. Mr. Kidd deserves better treatment than he has accorded to his reviewers. They may dislike his attitude towards his predecessors in the paths of historical and sociological enquiry; they may feel that he sometimes unconsciously resembles the local preacher who boasted that he had "let 'Uxley 'av it 'ot"; but, on the whole, they recognise that he has thought for himself, with vigour and freshness, and expounded his views in a manner that claims attention; they welcome both his strenuousness and his optimism as a relief from the dilettantism and pessimism of so much that is written in these decadent days; and they rejoice in the appearance of this "nineteenth thousand" as testimony that serious reading and serious thinking cannot be so uncommon in England as a cursory inspection of the contents of the railway bookstalls would lead one to believe. They are, therefore, disposed to pay Mr. Kidd the genuine compliment of continuing to argue with him, in spite of the contempt with which he evidently regards them. If the argument does not reach Mr. Kidd, it may be worth the consideration of some of his readers.

Let us begin by borrowing Mr. Kidd's own restatement of his position both to make our criticism clearer, and in deference to his complaint that opponents have left his central thesis untouched. His one purpose has been, he tells us, "to state in simple scientific terms, and without the necessity for starting with any equipment of teleological assumption, that which has presented itself to the writer as a natural law of human evolution hitherto unenunciated." He finds "the central feature of human history" to be a conflict between two opposing forces, religion and reason. Religion, with its extra-rational or supernatural sanctions, is "the essential motive force from which all cosmic progress in society proceeds." The tendency of reason in the individual, if uncontrolled, is always towards disintegration and the arrest of the evolutionary process. Hence, according to our author, we arrive at these four "fundamental principles of history":—

1. All religion is essentially ultra-rational. No form of belief is capable of functioning as a religion in the evolution of society which does not provide sanctions for conduct beyond, and superior to reason.
2. The social system founded on a form of religious belief, forms an organic growth which is the seat of a series of historical phenomena unfolding themselves in obedience to laws that may be enunciated.
3. The process at work in human society is always developing two inherently antagonistic but complementary tendencies; namely, (1) the tendency requiring the increasing subordination of the individual to society, and (2) the rationalistic tendency leading the individual at the same time to question, with increasing insistence, the authority of the claims requiring him to submit to a process of social order in which he has absolutely no interest, and which is operating largely in the interests of unborn generations. In a healthy and progressive society, the fundamental principle of its existence is, that the second tendency must be continually subordinated to the first. But the intellect has no power to effect this subordination.
4. The problem with which every progressive society stands continually confronted is: How to retain the highest operative ultra-rational sanction for those onerous conditions of life which are essential to the maintenance of its place in the evolutionary process; and at one and the same time to allow the freest play to those intellectual forces which, while tending to come into conflict with this sanction, contribute nevertheless to raise to the highest degree of social efficiency the whole of the members.

It is a strange philosophy of history, this at which Mr. Kidd has arrived, one that he could hardly have reached from the study of history itself. In order to justify his theory, he has to account for this strange fact: that in the centuries when supra-rational sanctions were supreme, when the reason was completely dominated by what he calls himself "a stupendous system of other-worldliness," cosmic progress was apparently at a standstill; whilst the most notable advances, including those which he claims as the special triumphs of Christianity—the abolition of slavery, the breaking down of class-barriers, the growth of the humanitarian feeling—have taken place during the centuries that have followed the Reformation and since reason asserted to an unprecedented extent her right to control human affairs. What is Mr. Kidd's explanation? It is delightfully simple: cosmic progress does not show itself at once or act immediately, and the progress that has taken place since the Reformation is the fruit of the ages that preceded! To this kind of "supra-rational" argument there is no answer.

On the scientific side the position seems every whit as indefensible. Weismannism in natural science is still only in the stage of a hypothesis. But even if it were a proved law, the application of it to the human history of a few centuries forgets the immeasurably slow working of the evolutionary process.

But all Mr. Kidd's four formulæ, and all the book in which he works them out, are vitiated by his false identification of human reason with the self-regarding instinct of the individual. Mr. Kidd explains that he uses the

[1] In 1879 it took General Lazareff five and a half months to provide a force of 18,000 men with food and transport, the latter melting away as it was pushed forward to the advanced posts, while the troops and camels waiting at the base on the eastern shore of the Caspian consumed food and forage nearly as fast as they could be brought by ship from the ports on the north and the west of that sea.

[2] "Social Evolution." By Benjamin Kidd. Nineteenth Thousand, with Appendix containing a Reply to Criticisms. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.

word "reason" in its natural as opposed to its transcendental sense. Nobody wishes him to use it in a transcendental sense. There are things too high for reason to attain to, so long as it remains human reason at all. Plato imagined an "idea of good" which reason could not demonstrate but must assume as its starting point; the doctrine of Coleridge was much the same. In proclaiming the inadequacy of unaided reason to solve the riddle of the universe, Mr. Kidd has the support of these eminent thinkers, and as against the scientific materialists, he is justified. But if we take reason in its ordinary sense, as it was defined by the non-transcendental Locke, "the faculty which distinguishes man from the brute," we shall find no justification for asserting that reason simply tells each individual to strike for himself and to get the most he can at the present moment. Man is a social animal, born with strong self-regarding instincts, but with other instincts too, and reason does not pronounce simply for the first. When he is governed only by utilitarian motives, reason tells him that he cannot secure happiness by giving unrestricted play to the self-regarding instincts, that his happiness is dependent on his neighbours with whom these instincts bring him into collision. And if reason alone cannot give him motives for self-sacrifice, it is only reason that can pronounce on the adequacy of the motives when they are presented. To speak of the individual as having "absolutely no interest" in the process of social order is to conceive of him as an isolated atom, a strange monstrosity in human society. Again, when Mr. Kidd speaks of a generation as "confronted with a problem," to what is the problem presented, if not to the reasoning faculty? Yet the reason is to be kept strictly subordinate! And to what faculty in man, finally, does Mr. Kidd's own argument address itself? By what faculty does he arrive at his formulæ, and how are we to measure them?

But if Mr. Kidd has done dishonour to reason, it cannot be said that he has ennobled religion. Its function in the cosmic process is to intensify the strife through which evolution proceeds. The feelings of tenderness and compassion which religion inspires would seem to be worse than useless. They not only add to our own pain, as we watch the tragedy of the universe, but they increase the sufferings of those we seek to help, the inexorable law of evolution making the strife ever keener and keener. Nor are we told of any consolation for the weakly who are crushed out in the struggle. That would involve a "teleological assumption."

The popularity of "Social Evolution" is doubtless in part due to the fact that, as Lord Farrer remarked in an able criticism which he contributed to the *Contemporary Review* in 1894, it promises "much to many men." The scientific man is attracted by the application of evolutionary formulæ to human history; the priest is delighted by the subordination of reason to religion, and the timidly pious layman comforted by being released from the struggle to reconcile the two. But neither party has much to gain from the new doctrine. The scientific man finds that his formula has only been borrowed to overthrow reason; and the religious man that his religion has been emptied of the consolations for the sake of which he clings to it. In spite of the many good qualities which make Mr. Kidd's work worth reading and thinking about, we hope that its author will live to outgrow his own argument. This, it will be remembered, was the case with the late Professor Drummond, the accomplished writer of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World."

MARK TWAIN'S IMPRESSIONS OF INDIA.[1]

If Mark Twain will not increase his reputation by his new book, he will at least lose no old friends. The qualities that have endeared him to so many thousands of English-speaking folk are all present, and if the humour is less riotous and all-pervading than of old, there is perhaps a gain of other elements not less valuable. *Homo sum, nihil humani a me alienum puto.* That is the secret of Mark Twain's success, as it was the secret of the success of Dickens.

There are solecisms and uglinesses of style and expression that are enough to erect each particular hair upon the head of the literary critic. There are, what is much worse, real vulgarities of thought and feeling, like the "simple rules for saving money" on p. 301, which may be "wrote sarcastic," but will at least be taken seriously by the vast majority of readers. It is partly, no doubt, Mark Twain's faults—his descent to the level of the ordinary unrefined man—that account for his popularity. But on the whole his success is due to his good qualities, and above all to that sympathy with humanity which finds such perfect expression in the most memorable line of Terence. He is Democritus and Heracleitus, the laughing and the weeping philosopher, in one. If he is continually poking fun at the vanities of human life, if he makes us think of ourselves and our fellow-men as sorry puppets strutting across the stage of life, yet our laughter is never suffered to become hard and soulless. Turn the page, and we are face to face with the *lacrimae rerum*, "the sense of tears in mortal things." It has been said with some justice that American humour is always polemical, that it is always "scoring" off somebody. But Mark Twain's humour will win him no enemies—except, perhaps, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, of whose notions of international morals he speaks with refreshing directness.

The popularity of Mark Twain, like the popularity of Dickens, should help one to think well of human nature. With all the shortcomings of the Pudd'nhead Wilson's gnomic morality (and it is only just to remember the author's own plea that "it is more trouble to make a maxim than it is to do right"), Mark Twain is on the whole a power that makes for righteousness. Verses, in these unpoetical days, no longer hit him whom a sermon flies. But the shaft of prose satire still flies home; and Mark Twain is on such good terms with his large audience that he is even allowed to drop satire and to sermonise undisguisedly. After a vivid description of the horrors of "Thuggee" in India, now happily a thing of the past, this is how he points the moral to his reader:

> We white people are merely modified Thugs; Thugs fretting under the restraints of a not very thick skin of civilisation; Thugs who long ago enjoyed the slaughters of the Roman arena, and later the burning of doubtful Christians by authentic Christians in the public squares, and who now, with the Thugs of Spain and Nimes, flock to enjoy the blood and misery of the bull-ring. We have no tourists of either sex or any religion who are able to resist the delights of the bull-ring when opportunity offers; and we are all gentle Thugs in the hunting season, and love to chase a tame rabbit and kill it. Still, we have made some progress—miscroscopic and in truth scarcely worth mentioning and certainly nothing to be proud of—still, it is progress; we no longer take pleasure in slaughtering or burning helpless men. We have reached a little attitude where we may look down upon the Indian Thugs with a complacent shudder; and we may even hope for a day, many centuries hence, when our posterity will look down upon us in the same way.

A little later he prints as a parallel to the confession of a Thug an extract from Gordon Cumming's travels, describing, with too apparent relish, the death-agonies of an elephant.

The new volume of "Tramps" (the word is used more loosely than ever, for most of the "tramping" was done by sea) takes us to Australia, India, and South Africa. It is naturally the Indian part that most concerns us here. The writer's great descriptive powers are seen at their best in his picture of Bombay, from which we quote the opening paragraph:—

> BOMBAY! A bewitching place, a bewildering place, an enchanting place—the Arabian Nights come again! It is a vast city; contains about a million inhabitants. Natives they are, with a slight sprinkling of white people—not enough to have the slightest modifying effect upon the massed dark complexion of the public. It is winter here, yet the weather is the divine weather of June, and the foliage is the fresh and heavenly foliage of June. There is a rank of noble great shade-trees across the way from the hotel and under them sit groups of picturesque natives of both sexes: and the juggler in his turban is there with his snakes and his magic; and all day long the cabs and the multitudinous varieties of costume flock by. It does not seem as if one could ever get tired of watching this moving show, this shining and shifting spectacle. . . . .

To Mark Twain as an American tourist, the bewildering novelty of everything was even greater than it is to the ordinary English visitor on his first arrival in India. Even pyjamas were an unexplored mystery—a mystery which he expounds with great detail, but without enthusiasm, to the American nation. He thought the people of India "much the most interesting people in the world—and the nearest to being incomprehensible."

> You soon realise that India is not beautiful; still there is an enchantment about it that is beguiling, and which does not pall. You cannot tell just what it is that makes the spell, perhaps, but you feel it and confess it, nevertheless. Of course at the bottom you know in

[1] "More Tramps Abroad." By Mark Twain. London: Chatto and Windus.

a vague way that it is *history*; it is that that affects you, a haunting sense of the myriads of human lives that have blossomed, and withered, and perished here, repeating and repeating and repeating, century after century and age after age, the barren and meaningless process; it is this sense that gives to this forlorn, uncomely land power to speak to the spirit and make friends with it; to speak to it with a voice bitter with satire but eloquent with melancholy.

He pays a generous tribute to the English officials, whose success he attributes to their "tact, training and distinguished administrative ability, reinforced by just and liberal laws," and to their "keeping their word to the Native whenever they give it." Such a credit among the nations of the world, one feels, is not lightly won and must not be lightly lost. But he is astonished at the small space that English newspapers give to Indian affairs. They send their correspondents, not to India, but to the Continent, "to report the doings of the princelets and the dukelets, and where they are visiting and whom they are marrying." Englishmen may feel justly rebuked; and if "More Tramps Abroad" helps to increase their interest in India, that will be a fresh reason for gratitude to the genial author.

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

BY OUR OWN ONLOOKER.

During the last week Lord George Hamilton has been several times questioned by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. MacNeill, and Mr. H. Roberts, upon points connected with the overbearing treatment extended to the brothers Natu, the imposition of punitive police at Poona, and other points. The questions will no doubt be alluded to more fully elsewhere, but I may make a general remark or two about the answers. Lord George has a very extensive ignorance about all Indian affairs. To quote an old saying, what he does not know about India would fill a very large book—nay, a library. And this is made amusingly evident by his methods in the House. When the question of which he has received notice is put, the noble lord carefully reads the reply provided for him by the permanent officials. He reads it with a certain air of confidence which might gain him the credit of understanding the subject were it not for his abject and pitiable floundering directly a supplementary question is put. Having no longer a typewritten manuscript upon which to rely, the noble lord is so utterly at sea and out of his depth as to excite a contempt somewhat akin to pity.

It happened on one day during the week that in Mr. Curzon's absence Lord George was put up to give Foreign Office answers. Someone must have been playing a bad joke when he was fixed upon—and the result no doubt answered the joker's wildest hopes. For of course Lord George's answers were ludicrously insufficient. I really believe, incredible though it may appear, that some subjects came up as to which it was discovered that he knew less than he does about Indian affairs. Of course there was a perfect rush of indignant supplementary questions and of protests that he had entirely ignored most of the enquiries contained in the questions on the paper. He stood there looking like the well-known picture of a candidate for that charitable institution which takes in the "helpless, hopeless, and homeless." Indeed, the Speaker at length intervened with this delicious remark: "the question on the paper has been fully answered. The noble lord has said that he has no information." That ruling would be spoiled by comment.

The daily debates on the Irish Local Government Bill have not been interesting, perhaps, when examined in detail, but they have been both interesting and significant when viewed as a whole. For there have been decided and almost strenuous differences between the English Radicals and the Irish Nationalists. And while the object of the Radicals' attack has been the Irish landlord, strange to say the Irish Nationalists have posed as the champions of their hereditary foes. Of course there is an explanation for this. The bribes which the Government are handing over to the Irish landlords are the price of the Bill. Those landlords are being dispossessed of certain extensive powers which they enjoyed and misused under the old system of local government, and they demand payment. The Government seek to stop their mouths with a sop, and the Nationalists, seeing there is no other way of getting rid of these men, consent. But what the English Radicals feel is that it is hard that the British taxpayer should be called upon to pay a heavy perpetual charge to go into the pockets of the worst representatives of a bad class. Some of them have been very outspoken—young Radicals like Mr. Strachey and Mr. McKenna, that sturdy fighter Mr. Logan, who is always ready to smite the landlord, and some of the freelances from Wales—notably Mr. Sam Evans. These attacks have produced stinging retorts from Mr. Tim Healy, who by the irony of fate and "the imperiousness of circumstances" has been compelled to stand up for the Irish landlords.

While all this has been going on, where have been the right hon. gentlemen known as the Liberal leaders? They have left the front Opposition bench tenantless for the most part, the only figure in the vast expanse being that of Mr. Hemphill enjoying a magnificent isolation. Nor has this passed without comment. Of course, Mr. Gerald Balfour, when unable to reply to the Radical arguments, has taken refuge in pointing out the absence of the leaders, and on Tuesday night I heard so unsensational a member as Mr. M'Laren speaking bitterly of "our so-called Liberal leaders." Anyone who knows the House will know that when such things are said openly in debate, much more is said behind the scenes—and so it is in this case. Not much is said against Sir William Harcourt. As a rule he fights well, and he cannot be expected to do everything. But he is embarrassed by having men for colleagues who are Liberals only in name—notably Sir Henry Fowler. No friend of India wants to see him at the India Office again—and no friend of Liberalism wants to see him in another Cabinet.

The return of Mr. Soames, the new member for South Norfolk, by more than 1,300 majority in place of a Liberal Unionist who had had a majority of more than 800, was one of the most sensational wins the Liberals have had since the general election, and his introduction on Monday was most enthusiastically greeted. Quite a crowd of the heroes and especially the heroines of the fight came up to see him take his seat, and for a time they made the lofty and the dull old corridors of the palace bright with their presence, and gay with their chatter and laughter. Here again the victory was won entirely by the rank and file, and some little friction was caused by the official clique insisting that the senior Liberal whip should be one of the introducers.

Tuesday was an amusing and interesting day in the Lords, for then and there Lord Salisbury discoursed on many things. Lord Kimberley had given notice that he would ask a question about Wei-hai-wei. They manage things in the Lords differently from the procedure in the Commons, and so in putting this question Lord Kimberley made a speech of half an hour's duration. Three minutes of it were devoted to Wei-hai-wei, and twenty-seven minutes to Mr. Chamberlain's wild harangue at Birmingham, which by the way has been the great topic of talk about the House during the week. Lord Salisbury spoke for half an hour in reply, and he reversed the proportion, giving three minutes to Mr. Chamberlain's utterances and twenty-seven to Wei-hai-wei. Of course he knew well enough that Lord Kimberley would speak about Mr. Chamberlain's speech, as every newspaper had announced the fact. But there was nothing about it on the notice paper, and so Lord Salisbury, with a broad smile, said he was quite taken by surprise. He could not follow his noble friend because he had not a copy of Mr. Chamberlain's speech by him, and it was necessary to study the extracts made by Lord Kimberley in the light of the context! Of course this was mere noble fooling.

He continued in the same vein for some time. He was good enough to acknowledge that when he spoke of China as "upright," and Mr. Chamberlain described her as "prostrate," the metaphors could hardly be said to be on all fours. But then he entered into an elaborate explanation that so much depended upon the point of view. From one remark in his peroration, a remark to the effect that our foreign policy aims at "cultivating the friendship of all the powers with whom we come into contact," it would seem that the Foreign and Colonial Secretaries do not confine their differences to mere matters of metaphor. For while Lord Salisbury wants to be friends all round, Mr. Chamberlain tells Russia that her statesmen are untruthful, and adds the polite little jest that "who sups with the devil must have a long spoon."

But the most interesting point in the Premier's speech

was the explanation why we took Wei-hai-wei. It was to encourage China! Lord Salisbury says that the empire requires courage, and needs to be strengthened against despair. So we take some of her possessions. Other nations are also busily engaged in encouraging that ancient empire, and it looks as if before long she may have got rid of all her despair, and all her territory too. Lord Salisbury argued also that by taking Wei-hai-wei we should favourably impress other nations in the East, notably Korea and Japan, nations which he said will have much to do with shaping the destinies of the future. The idea apparently is that if they do not mind what they are about, we shall be encouraging them, too, one of these days.

It was an ingenious speech, so far as political theories are concerned. First of all, there was the skill with which he dropped the awkward topic of Mr. Chamberlain's amazing outburst in Birmingham; and then there was this curious explanation about Wei-hai-wei. As to such practical matters as the probable cost of this venture Lord Salisbury would say nothing. It was a mere matter of detail for experts, and he has a soul above detail, as has his nephew, Mr. Balfour. But he said the experts will let us know how much we have to pay in due time. No doubt they will.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, May 12.—San Juan, Puerto Rico, was to-day bombarded by the American Squadron. Two American gun-boats and the torpedo-boat "Winslow" pursued a Spanish gunboat into Cardenas Harbour, and were fired upon by the batteries and Spanish ships. After a sharp encounter the American vessels withdrew, the "Winslow" being badly damaged and an officer and four men killed.

At a meeting of the Spanish Cabinet it was declared that Spain would only accept an honourable peace, and that conferences at Washington would be useless if they were held simply to sanction the "iniquity" of the United States. From Madrid it was reported that Señor Sagasta would reconstruct his Cabinet before Monday, and that new men would be selected to fill the places of the present Ministers for the Colonies, Foreign Affairs, Marine, and Public Works.

The Rome Correspondent of the *Times* having contrived to evade the strict censorship over telegrams, sent some further details of the rioting at Milan, where the state of things for three days was, he said, one of "rampant anarchy and armed rebellion." Up to Sunday night 80 persons had been killed and 300 wounded. There had also been desperate rioting at Monza, Pisa, Naples, Treviso, and Genzano, near Rome. At Monza it was feared that the Royal Palace might be burned. Hitherto the army had remained unflinchingly loyal.

Friday, May 13.—The Spanish fleet from Cape Verd arrived last evening at Port de France, Martinique, and was reported to-day to be westward of that island. Yesterday Rear-Admiral Sampson, with nine vessels of his squadron, bombarded San Juan, Puerto Rico. The appearance of the Spanish squadron in West Indian waters, after the *quasi*-official report of its arrival at Cadiz, caused anxiety in the United States, where uneasiness was felt as to the safety of the battleship "Oregon." It was generally felt that a serious naval engagement must shortly take place, but naval authorities in the States admitted that they did not know where it would be fought, and they acknowledged the soundness of the Spanish strategy. Rear-Admiral Sampson's official report of the bombardment of San Juan stated that no armed vessels were found in the port, that he began his attack on the batteries defending the city at daylight on Thursday, and that the engagement lasted about three hours, resulting in much damage to the batteries, and incidentally to adjacent parts of the city. The batteries replied to the American fire, but without material effect. One man was killed on board the "New York," and seven were wounded in the whole squadron. No serious damage was sustained by any of the ships. Other accounts from the American side stated that one of the forts was reduced to a heap of ruins and the others were much damaged. It was believed that the loss of life must have been great. Spanish official accounts asserted that the damage done by the American fire was slight, and that only two persons were killed. They also alleged that the American vessels were severely damaged, and that one of them was disabled and had to be towed away.

News of a serious character was received to-night from Hawarden. The bulletin issued stated that Mr. Gladstone had had a fair night, and was comparatively free from pain. There was evidence, however, of steadily increasing weakness and failure of the circulation.

A magnificent Liberal victory was achieved in South Norfolk, the poll of which was declared to-day. The vacancy was caused by the resignation of Mr. F. Taylor, Liberal Unionist, who at the last election was returned by a majority of 836. Mr. A. W. Soames, the Liberal candidate, to-day secured a majority of 1,330, a turnover only once equalled since the general election.

In a speech at Birmingham Mr. Chamberlain referred to the gravity of the outlook, declaring that the situation was too serious and too critical to be dealt with in any party spirit, and that the time might not be far distant when the Government would have to appeal to the patriotism of the whole country. In the face of European combinations and alliances England stood alone. It was the policy of the Government to draw all parts of the Empire closer together, and to establish bonds of permanent amity with the United States.

Saturday, May 14.—Further news from Manila was brought by a United States despatch boat. The "Calloa," a Spanish gunboat, had been captured while attempting to enter the port. There were no signs that the Spanish authorities were prepared to capitulate, and it was evident that the city could only be reduced by bombardment or famine. Many of the residents, fearing bombardment, had sought safety in the suburbs, taking with them their furniture and property. The Insurgents occupied the town of Cavite after its evacuation by the Spanish. One of their leaders was now in Hong-Kong communicating with President M'Kinley as to the future government of the Philippines under a United States Protectorate.

The Spanish fleet was sighted off the coast of Venezuela. Admiral Sampson's squadron had arrived at Puerto Plata, and the American flying squadron was awaiting orders off Charleston. These dispositions, it was said, pointed to a postponement of the expected great naval battle to some other day, the United States fleet being to-day a hundred miles nearer Havana than the Spanish. Meantime, 12,000 men were concentrated at Tampa, ready to be despatched to Cuba, 60,000 volunteers in all having been mustered in the United States.

Prince Henry of Prussia, on his arrival in Peking, was welcomed by the Emperor's brother and Chinese officials, and entertained in a pavilion. He was carried in a chair borne by Imperial coolies to the German Legation, where he received visits from the representatives of the Powers.

Sunday, May 15.—According to to-night's bulletin Mr. Gladstone's debility was extreme; but he was free from suffering, and his mind was perfectly placid. It was decided that two bulletins should be issued on Monday.

Monday, May 16—To-night's bulletin stated that Mr. Gladstone had passed a comfortable day, and had taken nourishment well. His strength was consequently well maintained. It was stated that the Queen had sent an autograph letter expressing her gratitude for the work Mr. Gladstone had done for the country. A long telegram had also been received from the Princess of Wales.

The movements of the Spanish Fleet under Admiral Cervera continued to be uncertain, and to cause much anxiety in Washington. It was stated that at the instigation of the American Consul at Curaçoa they were required by the Dutch authorities to leave that port, but they were believed to be still near, and a New York paper published to-night a report that three more Spanish cruisers from Cadiz had joined them, or arrived in their neighbourhood. Rear-Admiral Sampson's squadron was believed to be in the Windward Passage, manœuvring with the intention of forcing an engagement. Commodore Schley's flying squadron, after cruising three days without sighting an enemy, arrived off Charleston on Sunday, and was ordered to Key West.—Señor Sagasta to-day had an interview with the Queen-Regent in Madrid, and tendered the resignation of the Ministry, which was accepted, and he was commissioned to reconstruct the Cabinet.

Prince Henry of Prussia had interviews with the Emperor and Empress of China at the Summer Place, Peking, on Sunday.—A contract was signed and confirmed by the Tsung-li-Yamên for a loan from a British syndicate for the construction of a railway connecting Nanking, Shanghai, Hang-chau, and Ning-po.

Tuesday, May 17.—A bulletin issued this afternoon announced that there had been a serious failure of Mr. Gladstone's strength, that the pulse was scarcely perceptible, and that unless there was a decided rally a fatal issue might be anticipated within the next twenty-four hours. In the evening there was a slight rally, and at a late hour to-night Mr. Gladstone was sleeping. All the members of his family had assembled at Hawarden.

There was no definite news respecting the movements or position of the hostile fleets in the Caribbean Sea. News from the Philippines indicated that the Spanish authorities were endeavouring by various methods to enlist the sympathies of the native population against the Americans. It was positively stated from Washington that President M'Kinley had resolved to comply with the request of General Merritt, the commander of the troops to be sent to the Philippines, for a larger force of regulars than was, in the first place, intended to be sent out. The question of the relations between the United States and Great Britain was attracting a large amount of public attention in the States, and sentiment in favour of an "Anglo-Saxon Alliance" was said to be increasing. The Ministerial crisis in

Madrid still continued, and it was not known that Señor Sagasta had yet made any substantial progress in the reconstruction of the Cabinet.

Mr. Chamberlain's speech was still the theme of much discussion in the Continental Press, and was respectfully and almost sympathetically handled by German journals supposed to be officially inspired.

WEDNESDAY, May 18.—Mr. Gladstone remained practically unconscious during the whole of to-day. Once or twice his strength seemed slightly to rally, but again relapsed, and according to the latest announcements he was gradually sinking, and would probably pass away during sleep. At almost all the numerous public functions which took place yesterday reference was made to the great national loss which was impending in the death of the aged statesman.

Sir William Harcourt was to have presided this evening at a dinner at the Holborn Restaurant given by the executive of the Home Counties Division of the National Liberal Federation to the candidates at the by-elections in the home counties since 1895, but, in view of the hopeless condition of Mr. Gladstone, Sir William only attended the preliminary reception of the guests and addressed a few words to them, stating that the passing away of the great statesman who for so many years had been the light, the guide, the hope, and the mainstay of the Liberal party was, as they all knew, unhappily imminent. The voice of party strife must be stilled in the presence of that solemn change. He mourned that day not only an honoured chief, but a dear and beloved friend, and must ask them to permit him to withdraw, in the hope that before long they might meet in happier times.

There was still a complete dearth of trustworthy news as to the movements of the hostile fleets in the Caribbean Sea. The Spanish squadron at Cadiz was now stated to be ready for sea, and it was reported that it was to proceed to the Philippines. The Spanish Cabinet had been reconstructed, with Señor Sagasta as Premier; Señor Leon y Castillo, Minister for Foreign Affairs; Señor Gamazo, Minister of Public Works; and Señor Romero Giron, Minister for the Colonies.

It was announced that the evacuation of Wei-hai-wei by the Japanese was begun on Tuesday, and was expected to be completed by Tuesday next.

THURSDAY, May 19.—Mr. Gladstone died this morning at five o'clock.

MR. A. M. BOSE'S CAMPAIGN.

TEXT OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

We have from time to time referred to the admirable work which Mr. A. M. Bose has been doing in stating the case for India at public meetings in this country. Below we print some of the most important resolutions which have been unanimously adopted by public meetings that Mr. Bose has addressed.

Resolution unanimously passed at a public meeting held at Cottenham (Mr. J. Todd, J.P., C.C., presiding) on March 5:—"This meeting strongly condemns the forward military policy as well as the reactionary and repressive internal policy adopted by the present Government in India, as alike unworthy of the traditions and the honour of England, and fraught with danger to the safety of the Empire."

Resolution unanimously passed at a public meeting held at Wisbech. It was moved by the Rev. J. L. James:—"This meeting enters its emphatic protest against the war waged on our Indian frontier, and the prosecution of what has been known as the forward policy of the Government in India. We believe an aggressive policy to be opposed to the true interests of British India. It means oppressive taxation of people for the most part pitifully poor, and cannot but raise doubts as to the beneficent intentions and character of the Government. But we desire especially to protest against what are called the punitive methods of this frontier war. The ruthless destruction and burning of villages on the refusal of tribes to accept the terms imposed upon them, thus causing suffering amongst women and children who can have done us no wrong, and engendering feelings of hate and exasperation for many years to come if they submit, a violation of the ordinary laws even of warfare, a return to methods of barbaric vengeance, and a discredit and a shame to a professedly Christian people."

Resolution adopted at Peterborough on March 14:—Mr. H. B. Hartley moved:—"That this meeting strongly condemns the forward military policy as well as the reactionary and repressive internal policy adopted by the present Government in India as alike unworthy of the best traditions and honour of England, and fraught with danger to the safety of the Empire; and further, that this meeting trusts that a liberal and sympathetic policy will be followed towards our fellow-subjects in India so as to secure their contentment and progress." Rev. W. J. Butler seconded, and the proposition was carried unanimously.

Resolution at Oldham on March 17:—Councillor Middleton moved and Mr. Freeman seconded, "That this meeting strongly disapproves of the imprisonment of British subjects in India without trial as being contrary to the principles of constitutional government, and protests against the repressive policy of the present Government as likely to produce serious discontent amongst the people of India to the detriment of the best interests of the Empire." The resolution was carried unanimously.

Resolution adopted at Market Harborough on March 21:—"That this meeting deplores the results which have as a whole attended the home, foreign, and Indian policy of the Government, and hereby affirms the necessity of a return to a sound Liberal policy which will conduce to the welfare and progress of the Empire irrespective of class, race, or creed."

Resolution at Leicester on March 22:—"That this council deplores the results which have as a whole attended the foreign, colonial, and Indian policy of the Government—a policy of alternately bullying the weak and making "graceful concessions" to the strong—which, since the accession of Lord Salisbury to office, has given rise to an unparalleled series of crises and complications, involving an expenditure on armaments beyond all precedent, and seriously compromising the honour and interests of the country."

Resolution adopted at Leicester on March 23:—"That this meeting, while recognising the heroism of the British and Indian troops, records its emphatic disapproval of the Indian frontier policy of the Government, and protests against the proposal to charge the Indian exchequer with the heavy expenditure incurred in this deplorable war."

Resolution at Great Harwood on March 28:—Mr. J. W. Baron proposed the following resolution:—"This meeting strongly condemns the military forward policy, and the adoption of a repressive policy in India, and in particular the imprisonment of British subjects without trial, and the passing of a law which is dangerous to the liberty of the Press. In the opinion of this meeting, such a policy is likely to compromise the honour and the interests of the Empire, and should be reversed at the earliest opportunity." Mr. J. J. Riley seconded this resolution, and it was carried unanimously.

Resolution at Manchester on April 15:—"This meeting strongly condemns the reactionary and repressive policy of the present Government in India, and in particular the imprisonment of British subjects without trial, the passing of a law which is dangerous to the liberty of the Press, and the attempt now being made to seriously curtail the privileges of municipal self-government hitherto enjoyed by the metropolis of India. In the opinion of this meeting, such a policy is likely to compromise the honour and the interests of the Empire, and should be reversed at the earliest opportunity."

Resolution at Hollinwood on April 18:—"This meeting condemns the injustice of taxing the Indian people with the whole cost of the recent war beyond the North-West Frontier of India. This meeting, further, sympathises with the people of that country in their present troubles, many of which are, in its opinion, due to the defects of the present system of government, which requires to be popularised by the inclusion in the higher ranks of administration of a much larger number of Indians, and a thorough reform of the Legislative Councils, by which means the Government would be strengthened, the people benefited, and the best interest of the Empire promoted."

Resolution at Manchester on April 19:—On the motion of Mr. T. Eggington, seconded by Mr. W. Wilkinson, and supported by Mr. Jesse Haworth, the following resolution was passed with acclamation:—"This meeting strongly condemns the reactionary and repressive policy now being pursued in India, and in particular the imprisonment of British subjects without trial, the passing of a law which is dangerous to the liberty of the Press, the virtual exclusion of the natives of India from posts in the Education Department, previously open to them, and the attempt now being made to seriously curtail the privileges of municipal self-government hitherto enjoyed by the metropolis of India. This meeting earnestly requests her Majesty's Government to reverse the prosecution of such a policy, which in its opinion is fraught with danger and is likely to create serious discontent and disaffection in India, and is opposed alike to the honour, tradition, and interest of this country."

Resolution at Haddenham on April 21:—"This meeting strongly condemns the Indian, home, and foreign policy of the Government."

WOMEN'S LIBERAL ASSOCIATION.

SPEECH BY MR. ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Sixth Annual Conference of the Women's National Liberal Association was opened on Tuesday morning in St. Martin's Town Hall, London. There was a large attendance, the hall being well filled. Lady Hayter presided at the morning session, and among those on the platform were Mrs. Bryce, Miss Shaw-Lefevre, Miss Orme, Mrs. Grimwade, Mrs. Crossley, Mrs. Reeves, Sir Francis and Lady Evans, Mr. and Mrs. Byles, Sir Arthur Hayter, Mr. Ellis Griffith, M.P., Mr. Herbert Paul, and Mr. Romesh Dutt.

MR. DUTT said: I consider it an honour and a privilege to be asked at this great annual gathering to say a few words on India, and I respond to the call with the utmost satisfaction, because there never was a time, probably within this generation, when Indian affairs

demanded your attention more urgently, and when my countrymen needed a larger share of your help, your sympathy, and your good wishes. You are aware that last year, at the very time when the people of this country and the people of British colonies and dependencies all over the world were celebrating the Diamond Jubilee of the reign of their beloved Queen, India was passing through a series of calamities which find no parallel in the previous history of the country. A famine severer in the area affected than any previous famine of which there is any record desolated the fairest provinces of India. A plague unprecedented in its extent and virulence half-depopulated for a time our fairest towns, and has travelled from Poona to Bombay, and from Bombay to Calcutta. And, as if these natural calamities were not sufficient, the Tory Government brought upon themselves a disastrous war with tribes living beyond the Indian frontier who are our best friends if we leave them alone—(cheers)—and who are our worst enemies if we needlessly interfere with their tribal independence. (Cheers.) But it is not of these great calamities that I wish to speak this morning. The famine happily is over, and the one consoling incident connected with this famine is the sympathy and the help which were exhibited by the people of this country with their fellow-subjects in India. You, ladies and gentlemen, sent out from your private purses over half-a-million of English money for the sufferers in India; it was a kind act, which has not been forgotten, and will not be forgotten, by the people of India; and I may inform you that the Indian National Congress, at their last annual meeting, passed a resolution to collect and send a thousand pounds to the Lord Mayor of London, with a request to erect a suitable monument in some public place in London to mark the gratitude of the people of India for the help and sympathy they received from Englishmen and Englishwomen at the time of their sorest need. (Cheers.) But though the famine of the past year is over, the question will arise in thoughtful minds why India is afflicted by such frequent famines under British rule. It was the sixth great famine which has visited India within the sixty years of her Majesty's reign, and these six great famines have swept away something like eight or ten millions of the population of India. It is a sad chapter in the history of British rule in India, and the lesson which these famines teach us is that so long as an exorbitant and ever-increasing land tax is raised from the poor cultivators of the soil their condition will never improve, and they will never be safe from famines and deaths in the future. We in India are not now a great manufacturing nation, nor are we a great commercial nation; but we *are* a great agricultural nation, and four-fifths of the population of India subsist directly or indirectly on agriculture. If the Government of India which is virtually the landlord over the greater part of India performs the duties of a good landlord, and grants fixity of tenure and fixity of rental to the cultivators, the cultivators can save something in good years to meet the calamities of bad years as they do in Bengal. But if the Government of India continuously enhance the rental at each recurring settlement as they are now doing, the cultivating classes must necessarily be impoverished and indebted, and must perish in large numbers at each famine. Nowhere probably during the last year was the famine severer and more fatal than in the Central Provinces of India. And yet while the people were dying by the ten thousand, the settlement operations were proceeding and the rental was being enhanced. One of the best friends of India in the House of Commons, Mr. Samuel Smith (cheers) asked the Secretary of State for India, if, in view of the famine from which those Provinces have lately suffered, he would postpone for a few years the introduction of the enhanced rental. The Secretary of State for India declined to do so. (Shame.) If policy like this is pursued in India there can be no improvement in the condition of the masses, and no protection from poverty, starvation, and deaths from famine. The frontier war too is happily over, and I need not say much about it except to remind you that the present Government which brought on the war by reversing the Chitral policy of their predecessors have had the kindness and the generosity to throw the whole pecuniary burden of the war on the famine-stricken population of India. If there had been a frontier war in any of the self-governing colonies of England under similar circumstances, do you think England would have sent the bill of costs to the colony for payment? And is it fair or just or righteous that the impoverished and famine-stricken people of India should be treated differently because they are not self-governing, because they trust in the good faith and honour of England? Far different is the treatment which we received from the Liberal Government—(cheers)—and from that just and great and righteous statesman, whose name is as lovingly cherished in millions of grateful hearts in my own country, as it is in this country where he has lived and worked. (Prolonged cheers.) Seventeen years ago, Mr. Gladstone was in power when the Afghan war was concluded, and with that fairness and sense of justice which were a part of him, he contributed five millions of money from the English Exchequer towards the cost of that war. Contrast that noble action with the ungenerous and unjust decision of the Tory Government which is distributing doles to all its friends and supporters, but cannot make a contribution which India demands with justice. But I turn from the subject of the frontier war, to the internal administration of India. You would expect naturally that in a year in which we have suffered so much from an accumulation of disasters and calamities, we would at least receive some sympathy and benevolent treatment at the hands of the Government. The fact, however, remains—and I mention it with regret and sorrow because I have myself served under the Indian Government during the best years of my life—the fact remains that among all the dark periods of British rule in India, there is not a darker period for repressive legislation and for coercive measures than the last twelve months. You have heard how two respectable and honoured citizens of Bombay were deported by the Government and were kept in confinement for nine months without a trial, and that even now they have not been released from all restrictions. You have heard of the prosecutions instituted against the Indian Press because the Press dared to condemn the unwise step adopted by the Government in employing soldiers from barracks to institute house-to-house search for plague patients. You have heard of monstrous sentences passed by Indian judges on editors of newspapers, sentences which have shocked public opinion in this country as well as in India. And you have heard of the Acts recently passed by the Indian Government to virtually gag the Press of India—in spite of the opposition of all classes of the Indian community—European and Indian alike. I will not go into the details of these Acts, but I may merely allude to one or two of their clauses to give you an idea of this strange Draconian law. One clause is that if an Indian speaker or writer says or writes anything, even in this country, which may bring the Government of India into contempt, that Indian speaker or writer may be prosecuted for it—not here, not before a British judge or a British jury, but on his return to India, before an Indian magistrate, who is also the head of the police. Ladies and gentlemen, we in India have the very highest respect for authority and for the Government, but I am not sure that it is possible even to mention some of its recent doings without exciting some degree of contempt. And if what I have said this morning has excited in your minds any unamiable feelings towards the Government, I may look forward to the pleasure and the luxury of a criminal prosecution when I go back to India, whether it be six months hence or six years hence. (Laughter.) But seriously speaking, is there not something unworthy of British legislation in this strange law which empowers the Indian Government not to take action before an English tribunal for an action done in England, but to lie in wait till the supposed offender returns to India, and then to get him convicted by an Indian magistrate who is also the head of the local police? I will refer to only one more provision of this strange law. There is a provision in the criminal law of India by which Indian magistrates can demand securities for good behaviour from those who are by repute house-breakers and thieves and vagabonds, and to throw them into prison with hard labour in default of such security being given. I have myself, as an Indian magistrate, used this provision of the law, and have tried men with such notorious and infamous characters that whole villages turned out and asked for protection from their habitual crimes and outrages on society. Will you believe it, that by the new law editors of newspapers have now been placed in the same category in so far that magistrates are empowered to demand security from them, or in default to imprison them with hard labour? (Shame.) Imagine how much of the liberty of the Press would remain even in this country if every chief constable were empowered to require security for good behaviour from editors of London and country papers, and in default of such security to cast the editors into prison. Such a suppression of the Press would be a folly and misfortune in England; it is ten times more a folly and a misfortune in India. For in this free country you have the House of Commons and a hundred free institutions to give expression to your sentiments. In India we have no House of Commons and no free institutions, and to suppress the Press would be to suppress the only possible expression of public opinion. It would render despotism more despotic, it would silence criticism and suppress public opinion, it would endanger the empire. For if there be dissatisfaction in the land with certain measures of the Government, is it not far better and far safer that the people should speak it out—(cheers)—and that you should know it—(cheers)—that you should try to remove it—(cheers)—than that the dissatisfaction should work in the dark and burst out in a catastrophe? This is the just, the statesmanlike, and the true liberal policy, and this was the policy of the great Liberal leader who is departing from us. Twenty years ago the Tory Government were unwise enough to pass a law to gag the Vernacular Press of India. But when Mr. Gladstone came into power, I need hardly say the foolish Act was expunged from the Statute Book of India. And the people of India confidently trust and believe that when the great Liberal party will come once again into power, as they will do before long if we can judge from recent by-elections—(cheers)—the Gagging Act now passed will once more cease to disgrace the Statute Book of India. (Cheers.) Ladies and gentlemen, I have one more word to say before I conclude. You are all aware that the present Government has declared its intention to demolish the self-government of London and to destroy the great municipal powers enjoyed by the London County Council. You know how arduously the Tory leaders strove to influence the London elections in their favour, and how the great people of London have given the Government an answer whose import cannot be mistaken. And if the Government still persists in bringing forward a Bill, you may be quite sure that it is for the sake of appearances, and for gracefully retiring from the attitude they were unwise enough to take up. So, gentlemen, the thunderbolt which was so assiduously manufactured for London by the Tory Government has really fallen on our devoted heads in Calcutta. Twenty-two years ago the municipality of Calcutta received a constitution by which two-thirds of the members of the Corporation were elected by the tax-payers, the Government retaining the right to appoint the remaining third. You will not consider this a very great concession to the metropolis of a great country like India; but we are thankful for small mercies in India, and we have ever cherished the right to elect two-thirds of the Municipal Commissioners of Calcutta with the same ardent devotion with which you cherish, and rightly cherish, the great powers and privileges secured to your London County Council. During these 22 years the people of Calcutta have exercised their right of electing their representatives, and many of the ablest and most intelligent and the best educated men of Calcutta have taken a patriotic pride in serving their town as elected commissioners, and improving the town. Men who entered young have grown gray in the service of the town; they were proud to be useful servants of their town, and they were proud as British subjects, enjoying some at least of those privileges and rights which are extended wherever the British flag waves over England's world-wide empire. And the service which these elected commissioners have rendered in improving the sanitary condition of the town it is impossible to exaggerate. I have known Calcutta for forty years and more; and I can state with confidence that though

Calcutta even now is not sanitarily an ideal town, it is incomparably more cleanly and habitable and healthy than it was when the elected commissioners took the work in hand. Wise rulers like Sir Antony MacDonnell, whose name stands highest and foremost among the many able rulers now employed in India—(cheers)—have recognised the work of the elected commissioners, and have recognised the improvements made in the town. More improvements are urgently needed, and a wise and benevolent Government would have secured these improvements through the elected commissioners, whose zeal and patriotism are beyond question, and who have never withheld money when sanitary improvements were called for. But the Tory Government of the day sickens at the very idea of working through the people and by means of a popular institution, and they have introduced a Bill in the Bengal Council yesterday taking away all executive power from the members of the Corporation, and placing it in the hands of a foreign body of twelve men, of whom only four are to be elected by the Corporation. And it is proposed that the Corporation shall fix the rate of taxation, and the foreign body will have the duty which is always more or less a pleasant one of spending other people's money. (Shame.) Such is the blow aimed at the root of self-government in the metropolis of India, and it will rest with you people of England whether you will tolerate such repressive and retrograde legislation in your greatest dependency. Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you sincerely for the kind attention with which you have listened to me. Believe me, the empire of India has been won not by the sword but by good government—(cheers)—and the population of India, numbering nearly three hundred millions, can be held together, not by the sword but by good government. (Cheers.) Do not adopt Russian methods of coercion and repression—that will not save your Indian empire. Continue the policy which you have adopted in the past, of trust and confidence in the people, of accepting the help and the co-operation of the people in the management of their concerns—(cheers)—and your empire in India will be based on the firmest of all foundations, the affection and the loyalty of a great nation. (Loud cheers.)

THE COMMITTEE ON CURRENCY.

The following letter appeared in *Commerce* on May 11:—

To the Editors of "Commerce."

Sirs,—In *Commerce* of July 5, 1893, you were good enough to publish an interview with me by your representative with reference to the closing of the mints and the forcing up of the value of the rupee. May I request you to publish again that interview, as the views there expressed by me have proved true, and are as applicable to the present discussion. You will, I hope, allow me a few more remarks, to make my meaning clearer. It is said that by closing the mints and raising the value or exchange of silver in relation to gold, the Government have saved millions of rupees to the Indians. Nothing is further from the truth—the allegation is that by raising the exchange from about 12d. to 16d., India is saved 4d. per every rupee in her remittances for Home Charges of £19,000,000 every year. But it is not so. What Government has done is that the Government has introduced a fraudulent rupee, and compelled the taxpayer or the rayat to pay his tax in this rupee, *i.e.*, to pay in a "rupee" that is worth 1s. 4d. instead of what he was in ordinary course liable for, viz., a rupee of 1s. In other words, what Government has done is that it has forced the poor rayat to pay one-third more taxation in a fraudulent way than he was liable for, or compelled the poor rayat to part with one-third more of his produce to provide Government with a higher valued coin by falsely calling that coin by the name of "rupee," when in reality it is one and one-third rupee. What is, therefore, alleged to have been saved to the poor Indian is pure moonshine. The taxpayer is forced to part with the full amount of the produce to buy the £19,000,000, and by the jugglery of using the "rupee" of a higher value dust is thrown in the eyes of the people that saving is made by them, as if what is said to have been saved had rained from the sky. Common sense and the slightest reflection will show that £19,000,000 having to be paid, produce worth that money must be sold or remitted to this country, call your intermediate "rupee" what you like. The poor taxpayers of India *must* bear the burden of the iniquitous, "cruel and crushing tribute" he has to pay for his political slavery. It is the British Anglo-Indian, merchant, trader, official, and non-official, and capitalists to whom matters are made easy.

Why does Government not perform the following miracle: Pass a law that the "rupee" of India must be equal to a sovereign of gold, and that the rayat must pay his assessment in such "rupee," just as it makes now the rayat to pay $1\frac{1}{3}$ rupees in the name of "one rupee." Why then in order to remit the £19,000,000 Government will be able to say—"Look here, we have remitted £19,000,000, by means of only 19,000,000 rupees instead of 380,000,000 rupees, which £19,000,000 would be at 1s. per "rupee," and have thus performed the miracle of saving Rs. 361,000,000 in the year." Can anything be more absurd than such a claim? I have put an extreme case to show the whole absurdity and subterfuge of squeezing out one-third more taxation from poor wretched India under false pretences of calling $1\frac{1}{3}$ rupee as "one rupee." Now the cry is raised to have a gold standard. What does that mean? It means that all the little silver that is in British India, as well as the large quantity in Native States, must be deprived of a large portion of its present value, by throwing a large quantity on the market, and to bring a large quantity of gold at a still higher proportion of value, by the large additional demand created. All this loss in cheap silver and dearer gold to be squeezed out of the poor, wretched, famished rayat of India! Who will pay all this price of the conversion from silver to gold currency? Will the British traders, capitalists, officials and non-officials, at whose cry and clamour this has to be done for their benefit, pay a single farthing towards this conversion, beyond the infinitesimal share they pay of the taxation, and that by exploiting the country to their great profit with the land and labour of the Indians, who come in simply to slave as hewers of wood and drawers of water, to be taxed and "bled," as Lord Salisbury properly calls it, for the benefit of British people, with famine and plague as their only lot? There was a time, in the 60's, when I had myself joined in pressing for a gold standard, when the burden of the conversion would not have been great, as it would be at present. The crude, selfish legislation of the past few years in matter of currency has been awful. And why? Because the poor Indian taxpayer can be squeezed and "bled" with impunity and heartlessly, and what matters it to the gods on the heights of Simla, or why should the British people care for it? They have not to pay for it. It is for their cry and benefit that all this is to be done, and at the ruinous cost of the Indian taxpayer. As far as the home charges are concerned, it will be of no benefit or matter to the Indian. He will have to find or provide produce worth £19,000,000 sterling gold, whether the currency is gold or silver. It will be nice and easy for the officials and non-officials who have to make remittances, and they will have no bother of fall of or fluctuation of exchanges. Were it not for the tribute, "cruel, crushing tribute," as Sir George Wingate calls it, to be paid by India, the fall in silver or in exchange would not have been of any consequence, just as in other silver-using, free, self-governing countries. Trade would have adjusted itself according to the exchange. I do sincerely trust that the Committee of Enquiry which is to sit upon this subject will not be carried away by the clamour of selfish interests, but examine the matter closely from the point of view of the Indian people, to see how the taxpayer, and not the tax-eater and the exploiters of India, is affected.—Yours truly,

Washington House, DADABHAI NAOROJI.
72, Anerley Park, S.E.

The editors of *Commerce* appended the following paragraph from the interview of July 5, 1893:—

"The long and short of the whole Act will be a very heavy additional imposition on the mass of poor Indian taxpayers, the burden being imposed not in a direct, open, and honest way, but by the indirect and covert way the Indian Government have adopted. The closing of the mints and the fixing of a certain higher exchange will have this effect. Why Government should have interfered to protect the speculator at the cost of the taxpayer is by no means clear. Speculators should have taken their own risk as they do in every other line of business. The fall in the exchange is part and parcel of the merchant's business: the sudden fluctuation is the merchant's business, not the Government's, and so on. It is unjust. The action of the Government will restrict the internal trade of the country. The storm is upon us, and nobody knows what trees or shrubs will be uprooted. The Indian Council have not been able to sell their bills at 1s. 4d., and much will depend upon the action of the United States Government. When the Sherman Bill is repealed the storm will fall in full force and then die away, but their perpetual endeavours to stop the storm for more than twenty years have upset trade to a very large degree, but the Government have no right to interfere in trade affairs."

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, May 12.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petition from Morley, against State regulation; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate),—Copy presented—of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1897-8, compared with the results of 1896-7 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202.]

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts),—Copy presented—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1896-7 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts),—Copy presented—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203.]

THE INDIA OFFICE STORE DEPOT BILL.

India Office (Store Depot) [Expenses],—Committee to consider of

authorising the payment, out of the revenues of India, of the purchase money, compensation, and all expenses which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to empower the Secretary of State in Council to purchase Lands in connexion with the Store Department of the India Office (Queen's recommendation signified), upon Monday next (Secretary Lord George Hamilton).

A PARSEE PRISONER.

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to a prisoner named Fearoz, a Parsee, who was tried and convicted before the Recorder of London near the end of 1892, and whose sentence was one of four years' penal servitude, whether he could state what had become of the prisoner, whose sentence must have expired before this date.

Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY: I find that the man was certified insane and removed to Broadmoor in March, 1895. On the expiration of his sentence in the summer of 1896 he was made a pauper lunatic and taken to a pauper lunatic asylum, and I have no further information about him. I have no information to the effect that the man became insane in consequence of his imprisonment, but I will make enquiries.

Mr. DAVITT: Is it a fact that this prisoner became insane in consequence of his imprisonment?

Sir M. W. RIDLEY: I have no information whatever.

Mr. DAVITT asked the right hon. gentleman whether he would enquire of the medical authority what was the state of this man's health and mind when he was received in prison.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY: I am quite ready to make an enquiry.

Monday, May 16.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation from Sudbury, Leeds, Ryde, Bath, Glasgow, Edinburgh (three), Crouch End, and Ilfracombe; to lie upon the Table.

THE NATU BROTHERS.

Mr. WEIR asked the Secretary of State for India, whether at the time of the arrest of Sirdar Shrimant Balvant Ramchandra Natu, on July 28, 1897, the whole of the family property was attached and taken possession of by the collector of Poona, and his wife and family left without means of support:

And, had any allowance to her been authorised since that date; if so, would he state whether the allowance had been regularly paid.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the negative.

As regards the second paragraph, I am informed that on October 23, after enquiry into the value of the estate, a joint allowance of Rs. 550 a month was fixed for the maintenance of the brothers and wives and families of the two sirdars. The allowance was made payable to the brother Shiva Ramchandra Natu, but he declined to accept it until April 13.

THE INDIA OFFICE STORE DEPOT BILL.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON moved in Committee, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of the revenues of India, of the purchase money, compensation, and all expenses which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to empower the Secretary of State in Council to purchase Lands in connexion with the Store Department of the India Office":

It being after midnight, and objection being taken to further proceeding, progress was reported, and the matter was postponed to Thursday.

Tuesday, May 17.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation from Birmingham, Glasgow (two), Bo'ness, Hyde, Bridge of Allan, and Norwood; to lie upon the Table.

THE NEW LAW OF SEDITION. LORD G. HAMILTON HAS "DECIDED TO LEAVE THESE ACTS TO THEIR OPERATION."

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, whether authentic copies of the amended Indian Penal Code, Criminal Procedure Code, and Post Office Act would be in the hands of members before the House rose for the Whitsuntide Recess:

And, whether he would postpone for a reasonable time his decision on the question of disallowing those Acts under section 21 of 24 and 25 Vic., c. 67, until the House had had an opportunity of considering and discussing their provisions.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I hope that the papers relating to the Indian Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code Acts will be ready for presentation this week; those relating to the Post Office Act will be presented separately. I have decided to leave these Acts to their operation, and copies of despatches informing the Government of India of my decision will be found in the collections which are about to be presented.

THE INDIAN CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the terms of reference to the Indian Currency Committee, authorising them to submit any modifications of the proposals of the Indian Government, or any suggestions of their own, for the establishment of a satisfactory system of currency in India, left the Committee a free hand to deal with the question of the results that had followed the closing of the mints, and to recommend, if they thought fit, the re-opening of the mints for the coinage of rupees; and, if not, what were the limitations imposed by the terms of reference on the scope of the Committee's enquiry.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Currency Committee is a body of practical men assembled for a practical purpose, and they are empowered to enquire into any matter which they may think relevant to the subject which has been referred to them. If, therefore, they consider an enquiry into the policy of closing the Indian mints to be relevant to that subject, and if, having regard to the circumstances of the time and the practical possibilities of the case, they desire to make such enquiry and report upon its results, there is nothing in the terms of reference to prevent them from doing so.

THE DUTY ON KOHAT SALT.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, if any fresh arrangements had been made for the supply of salt to the tribes on the North-West frontier, the excessive dearness of the Kohat salt, which they could not do without, having been alleged by the Afridis as one of the chief grievances which led them to take up arms against the British Government.

Mr. LEWIS asked whether the duty on Kohat salt in 1883 was four annas, whether it was then raised to eight annas, whether in 1896 it was raised to two rupees, whether this was thirty-two times the natural price of salt, and whether the Government contemplated a reduction of the duty.

Lord G. HAMILTON: So far as I know at present, no fresh arrangements have yet been made respecting the duty on Kohat salt; but, as I stated in answer to a question on February 11, the subject is engaging the attention of the Indian Government, and I expect to receive a further report on the matter when the trade has been for some time resumed. As to the supplementary question of the hon. member for the Flint Boroughs, there is no doubt that in the last fifteen years there has been a great increase in the duty on Kohat salt to bring it up to the level of internal salt, but I cannot say off hand what the increase has been.

The following questions were upon the paper for Thursday, May 19, but, owing to the adjournment of the House in consequence of the death of Mr. Gladstone, they were not put.

Mr. COHEN,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Indian Government had already taken decided steps for the establishment of a gold standard in India:

And, whether the assent of the Secretary of State in Council and of Parliament was necessary for the introduction of a loan in sterling in London for the establishment of such gold standard.

Mr. DRAGE,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the southern section of the Commission for delineating the Burmo-Chinese frontier had dispersed:

Whether any work was done by the section:

And, whether he could state what action her Majesty's Government proposed to take in the matter, in view of the constant disturbances among the Kachia tribes on the frontier.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS,—To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the duty on Kohat salt was four annas per maund up to 1883; whether in that year it was increased to eight annas per maund; and whether in 1896 the duty was increased to two rupees per maund:

Whether that increase of duty upon one of the prime necessities of life was alleged by the Afridis to be one of the chief grievances which led to the frontier war:

And, whether the Government would take the necessary steps to remedy that grievance.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN,—To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the notification in the *Madras Government Gazette*, to the effect that the Legislative Council would meet at Ootacamund on May 13:

And, whether it was proposed to proceed with the Madras Tenancy Bill at Ootacamund; and, if so, how the important agricultural interests affected would have an opportunity of representing their case at that distant hill station.

The following notices of motion appear in the order-book of the House of Commons:—

Mr. PICKERSGILL,—East India (Penal Code)—That an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be pleased to disallow the Indian Penal Code Amendment Act, 1898.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE,—Opium—To call attention to the trade between India and China in opium, and to move a resolution.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS,—East India (Sedition and Control of the Press)—To call attention to the recent alterations in the Indian laws relating to Sedition and the Control of the Press; and to move a Resolution. [*An early day.*]

NOTICE TO INDIAN SUBSCRIBERS.

On and after Friday, July 1 next, no individual copies will be posted from the London Office of INDIA except to subscribers in respect of whom subscriptions have actually been received in London.

No names of individual subscribers will in future be printed unless they are actually accompanied by the full amount of the subscription.

The work of the business department of INDIA would be greatly facilitated if subscribers would themselves forward their subscriptions (with their numbers, names, and addresses) direct to the Manager at the London Office.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1897):
HON. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
A. M. BOSE.
W. S. CAINE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
H. S. KHALIL.
W. S. B. MACLAREN.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 62 Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Madhab Chander Chatterjee, Dinajpur.
8. Pabna	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur	Muzaffarpur District	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the	*N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing* "INDIA."	
Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapore District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
29. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Dist. (*except* Bhusawal)	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District [Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
37. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
38. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
39. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
40. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
41. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B L., Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "INDIA."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; SANGAM LAL, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS:
ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

BY ROBERT KNIGHT.

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

TOOTH-ACHE
CURED INSTANTLY BY
BUNTER'S Prevents Decay. Saves Extraction Sleepless Nights Prevented.
Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d. **NERVINE**

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), **8/6,** *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS,
STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS,
LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.

Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months ...	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year ...	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & CO.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE.

An Episode of Frontier War.

BY
WINSTON L. SPENCER CHURCHILL,
Lieutenant, the 4th Queen's Own Hussars.

With Maps, Plans, etc.
Crown 8vo. **7s. 6d.**

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.